



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 117th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 168

WASHINGTON, MONDAY, MARCH 28, 2022

No. 54

House of Representatives

The House met at 2 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. GARCIA of Texas).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
March 28, 2022.

I hereby appoint the Honorable SYLVIA R. GARCIA to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Margaret Grun Kibben, offered the following prayer:

Holy God, unite us in Yourself. And in that union, may we find mutual comfort in Your loving embrace and the desire to share together in Your spirit. May our manner reflect Your tenderness and our motive reflect Your compassion. In so doing, may we make Your joy and Your satisfaction in us complete.

Reveal to us how like-minded we are, despite the wide variety of opinions and passions. Remind us that we each belong to You, even more than to our allegiances and associations. Cause us to reflect how we each have received the bounty of Your love, no one of us more so than another.

In our interactions, may we be vessels of that same love, acknowledging that both our spirits and minds should be filled with Your own.

Do not allow our self-ambition or vain conceit to govern our actions, but humble us that we would esteem and uphold all others above ourselves.

Prevent us from appealing only to our own interests, but lift up our eyes that we each would take the time to

attend to the welfare of all those with and for whom You have called us to serve.

For You have shown us the example of selfless service. In this may we find our inspiration this day.

We offer our prayer in the strength of Your name.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 11(a) of House Resolution 188, the Journal of the last day's proceedings is approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FOSTER) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. FOSTER led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Byrd, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed bills of the following titles in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 253. An act to expand research on the cannabidiol and marihuana.

S. 2102. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Under Secretary for Health of the Department of Veterans Affairs to provide mammography screening for veterans who served in locations associated with toxic exposure.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests

for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

PROUD OF 360 YOUTH SERVICES

(Mr. FOSTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. FOSTER. Madam Speaker, for decades, the issue of homeless LGBTQ-plus youth hasn't gotten the attention it deserves, even as it is estimated they make up between 20 and 40 percent of all homeless youth in the United States.

That is why I am so proud that the Federal omnibus recently passed by Congress included \$3 billion for 360 Youth Services in Naperville so that they can launch a youth-affordable housing resource center to provide youth-specific housing and homelessness prevention services in DuPage, Kane, Will, and surrounding counties.

In the 11th Congressional District, we value our young people of all gender identities and sexual orientations. I am proud of what 360 Youth Services has planned for this funding.

Altogether, our office secured nearly \$19 million for very worthwhile projects in Illinois' 11th Congressional District that will benefit our entire community. This will be taxpayer money well spent.

SECRETARY WALSH IS A BAD-FAITH ACTOR

(Ms. FOXX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, Labor Secretary Marty Walsh needs to remember that he is a Cabinet member, not an activist. His one-sided involvement in active labor disputes is unfair and unprecedented.

He is a former union president and the first union member in nearly half a century to lead the Department of

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H3867

Labor. If you believe he can be an impartial arbiter, then I have swampland in New Mexico to sell you. The head of the AFL-CIO herself expressed approval of Walsh's willingness to work "behind the scenes."

Walsh's infamous picket line participation with strikers at the Kellogg's factory won't be his last attempt to interfere with labor-management disputes. Politico recently reported Walsh is "eager to help with others."

Walsh's pro-union advocacy disqualifies him from acting as an honest broker. He would rather protect his union boss cronies than protect workers and job creators.

OUR ECONOMY IS STRONGER THAN EVER

(Ms. GARCIA of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. GARCIA of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to celebrate the country's tremendous economic improvements.

While our economy is stronger than ever, the America COMPETES Act will strengthen the economy even more in the near future. But one key economic accomplishment during Biden's first year I would like to highlight is the large budget deficit decrease he produced.

In his first year, the deficit decreased by \$360 billion. That is an average drop of \$30 billion each month. That is huge.

This is a night-and-day difference from the past administration, which only increased the budget deficit year after year during his time in office. But even better, Biden is on track to reduce the deficit by more than \$1 trillion this year. This is truly remarkable.

We really are building a better America for generations to come.

VICTORY FOR UKRAINE

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, Ukraine, led by President Volodymyr Zelenskyy, is winning and will be victorious over Putin. Biden must send military aid now.

The ruse provided by incompetent Russian generals to claim eastern Ukraine is a trick. Just as America would not surrender by giving up a small part of the Eastern United States, such as Delaware, we know Putin must be defeated by peace through strength.

Victory is the only option to stop autocracy by rule of gun against democracy by rule of law, a clash of civilizations. The Chinese Communist Party will be stopped from mass murder in Taiwan. Iranian mullahs will be stopped from vaporizing the people of Israel. The world's largest democracy of India can thrive in a stabilized world.

I have faith in the Russian people, a great culture with great cultural influence adopted in America. There is legislation for defecting Russian troops, diplomats, and Duma members to be provided immediate refugee status to America and up to \$100,000 for any Russian military equipment turned over to Ukraine.

God bless Ukraine. God save Ukraine. Long live Volodymyr Zelenskyy.

CONGRATULATING IOWA'S HIGH SCHOOL BASKETBALL ALL- STATE HONOREES

(Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the achievements of several young men from Iowa's Second Congressional District.

Earlier this month, the Iowa high school basketball State championships were held in Des Moines. It was a week-end of competition and sportsmanship. While no school from the Second District won the championship, several young men recently earned all-State honors from the Des Moines Register.

Dayton Davis of Fort Madison and Shawn Gilbert of Central DeWitt were named to the Class 3A team. Eric Mulder of Pella Christian was named to the Class 2A team, and Maddox Griffin of Wapello was named to the Class 1A team.

In addition, Kaden Hall of English Valleys, Carter Harmsen of Mid-Prairie, Karl Miller of Pella, Pete Moe of Iowa City West, and Blaise Porter of New London earned honorable mention recognition.

Congratulations to all of these young men, teams, families, schools, and communities on achieving these honors. They are all well deserved.

Madam Speaker, I also knowledge that tomorrow, March 29, my daughter, Taylor Miller-Meeks, was born, which was one of the best days of my life.

BIDEN FOOD INSECURITY

(Mr. LAMALFA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAMALFA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to talk about the situation we have with agriculture and water in California and the President's acknowledgment just a couple of days ago that we are going to see a food shortage in the world but partially even in the United States of America.

That is unbelievable to me. How could we, the United States of America, be facing possible food shortages? Indeed, already on the store shelves is empty space.

I remember a story just a few years ago where Boris Yeltsin, President of Russia, of all places, came over and was visiting. They took him to a gro-

cery store in the United States, and he was amazed and blown away and even emotional by the variety we have here.

Yet, the priorities don't seem to be producing for Americans or even producing for those we help around the world. It seems to be based more on environmental needs, like in my home State of California where they are releasing more water out to the ocean than what is going to go to agriculture this year.

Why does this affect all Americans? Why does this affect you? Because so many of the crops that we grow in California supply somewhere between 90 and 98 percent of what Americans eat of those crops, and we are still doing this environmental stuff in California.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. GARCIA of Texas). Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 12 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1645

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. VEASEY) at 4 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The House will resume proceedings on postponed questions at a later time.

BETTER CYBERCRIME METRICS ACT

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 2629) to establish cybercrime reporting mechanisms, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 2629

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Better Cybercrime Metrics Act".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) Public polling indicates that cybercrime could be the most common crime in the United States.

(2) The United States lacks comprehensive cybercrime data and monitoring, leaving the country less prepared to combat cybercrime that threatens national and economic security.

(3) In addition to existing cybercrime vulnerabilities, the people of the United

States and the United States have faced a heightened risk of cybercrime during the COVID-19 pandemic.

(4) Subsection (c) of the Uniform Federal Crime Reporting Act of 1988 (34 U.S.C. 41303(c)) requires the Attorney General to “acquire, collect, classify, and preserve national data on Federal criminal offenses as part of the Uniform Crime Reports” and requires all Federal departments and agencies that investigate criminal activity to “report details about crime within their respective jurisdiction to the Attorney General in a uniform matter and on a form prescribed by the Attorney General”.

SEC. 3. CYBERCRIME TAXONOMY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall seek to enter into an agreement with the National Academy of Sciences to develop a taxonomy for the purpose of categorizing different types of cybercrime and cyber-enabled crime faced by individuals and businesses.

(b) DEVELOPMENT.—In developing the taxonomy under subsection (a), the National Academy of Sciences shall—

(1) ensure the taxonomy is useful for the Federal Bureau of Investigation to classify cybercrime in the National Incident-Based Reporting System, or any successor system;

(2) consult relevant stakeholders, including—

(A) the Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency of the Department of Homeland Security;

(B) Federal, State, and local law enforcement agencies;

(C) criminologists and academics;

(D) cybercrime experts; and

(E) business leaders; and

(3) take into consideration relevant taxonomies developed by non-governmental organizations, international organizations, academics, or other entities.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date on which the Attorney General enters into an agreement under subsection (a), the National Academy of Sciences shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report detailing and summarizing—

(1) the taxonomy developed under subsection (a); and

(2) any findings from the process of developing the taxonomy under subsection (a).

(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$1,000,000.

SEC. 4. CYBERCRIME REPORTING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall establish a category in the National Incident-Based Reporting System, or any successor system, for the collection of cybercrime and cyber-enabled crime reports from Federal, State, and local officials.

(b) RECOMMENDATIONS.—In establishing the category required under subsection (a), the Attorney General shall, as appropriate, incorporate recommendations from the taxonomy developed under section 3(a).

SEC. 5. NATIONAL CRIME VICTIMIZATION SURVEY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 540 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Bureau of Justice Statistics, in coordination with the Director of the Bureau of the Census, shall include questions relating to cybercrime victimization in the National Crime Victimization Survey.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$2,000,000.

SEC. 6. GAO STUDY ON CYBERCRIME METRICS.

Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller Gen-

eral of the United States shall submit to Congress a report that assesses—

(1) the effectiveness of reporting mechanisms for cybercrime and cyber-enabled crime in the United States; and

(2) disparities in reporting data between—

(A) data relating to cybercrime and cyber-enabled crime; and

(B) other types of crime data.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) and the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BENTZ) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on S. 2629.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 2629, the Better Cybercrime Metrics Act. This legislation improves our understanding and tracking of cybercrime so that we can do more to prevent it.

A 2018 Gallup Poll found that 1 in 4 Americans had been a victim of cybercrime. And I might say that it has exponentially grown during the pandemic. From stolen financial information, to system-wide shutdowns, to ransomware attacks, these crimes harm our families, our businesses, and our government.

The Council of Economic Advisers estimates that malicious cyber activities cost our economy as much as \$109 billion in 2016, and experts believe these costs are growing. The COVID-19 pandemic has increased opportunities for cybercrime with increases in remote work and the time people are spending online. Hackers also took advantage of our recovery efforts, stealing identities to file fake unemployment claims or fraudulent loan applications. And again, in the midst of other innocent Americans not being able to secure those dollars, and not being able to secure unemployment claims because of the fake process that clouded this system.

Many of the victims of these scams only learned that they were attacked when they went to file genuine claims and were told had already been submitted using their names or businesses.

Sadly, cybercriminals often target older Americans. In 2020, people over 60 accounted for the most complaints of any age group as collected by the FBI Internet Crime Complaint Center. People over 60 also had the greatest losses, with over \$966 billion lost to cybercrime in 2020.

We must do more to protect Americans from cybercrime, and that starts with a better understanding of what it is and how it occurs. The Better

Cybercrime Metrics Act will gather experts in law enforcement, business, and technology to create a taxonomy of cybercrime so we can define it and classify it in a uniform way.

This legislation also adds cybercrime to two important law enforcement tools used to track crimes: The National Incident-Based Reporting System and the National Crime Victimization Survey. Together, these provisions will ensure that law enforcement has a complete picture of when and where cybercrime occurs and who is harmed by it.

Finally, this bill directs the Government Accountability Office to conduct a study on reporting mechanisms for cybercrime and the disparities in cybercrime data relative to other types of crime data. Together, this legislation will put in place the tools to clearly define and classify cybercrime, to track cybercrime, and to better understand this serious threat.

Mr. Speaker, it is a very serious threat. And in addition to the monetary damages, people have been personally and psychologically impacted by losses, by lack of employability, by being rejected, for some of these claims having to be delayed when the individual who needs it is desperate and experiencing a desperate economic condition, to find that they have been, in essence, gamed by a cybercriminal. We must stop this.

And as I said earlier, one of the most vulnerable populations are individuals over 60. And really when you find those in their seventies, eighties, nineties, who have lived their lives, supported this Nation, and become victims of cybercrime, it is something that compels you to really want to stop this threat.

I commend Senators BRIAN SCHATZ and THOM TILLIS for their work on this bipartisan legislation. I also thank Representative ABIGAIL SPANBERGER for her leadership on the House companion to this bill. I was proud to stand with her in introducing the House companion, along with our Republican colleagues, Representative BLAKE MOORE and Representative ANDREW GARBARINO.

We must give law enforcement the tools to keep pace with new technology and to get a step ahead of the threats faced by our ever-evolving world. This bill takes an important step in that effort, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

MEMORANDUM EXCERPT

To: Members of the House Judiciary Committee
 From: The Honorable Jerrold Nadler, Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary
 Re: Markup of H.R. 4977, the “Better Cybercrime Metrics Act”; H.R. 55, the “Emmett Till Antilynching Act”; H.R. 5338, the “Radiation Exposure Compensation Act Amendments of 2021”; and H.R. 5796, the “Patents for Humanity Act of 2021”

Date: Tuesday, December 7, 2021

On Wednesday, December 8, 2021 at 10:00 a.m. in 2141 Rayburn House Office Building, the House Judiciary Committee will mark up the following measures: H.R. 3359, the “Homicide Victims’ Families’ Rights Act of 2021”; H.R. 4977, the “Better Cybercrime Metrics Act”; H.R. 55, the “Emmett Till Antilynching Act”; H.R. 5338, the “Radiation Exposure Compensation Act Amendments of 2021”; and H.R. 5796, the “Patents for Humanity Act of 2021”.

II. H.R. 4977, THE “BETTER CYBERCRIME METRICS ACT”

H.R. 4977, the “Better Cybercrime Metrics Act” would improve the U.S. government’s understanding, measurement, and tracking of cybercrime. The bill would direct the Department of Justice to work with the National Academy of Sciences, in consultation with relevant stakeholders, to develop a taxonomy of cybercrime that could be used by law enforcement to ensure that the National Incident-Based Reporting System (NIBRS), or any successor system, include cybercrime reports from federal, state, and local officials. It also directs the Bureau of Justice Statistics to include questions relating to cybercrime in the National Crime Victimization Survey. The bill also directs the Government Accountability Office (GAO) to report on the effectiveness of current cybercrime reporting mechanisms and highlight disparities in reporting data between cybercrime data and other types of crime data. This bipartisan bill was introduced on August 6, 2021 by Representative Abigail Spanberger (D-VA) and currently has 18 cosponsors. An identical Senate companion, S. 2629 (Schatz-HI, Tillis-NC, Cornyn-TX, Durbin-IL), was marked up by the Senate Judiciary Committee on November 18 and favorably reported on a unanimous voice vote. The Chairman will offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute to H.R. 4977.

A. GENERAL BACKGROUND

Cybercrime continues to be a significant threat to businesses, governments, and individual Americans. Cybercrime includes a broad range of conduct including phishing, ransomware, identity theft, and data breaches.¹ A recent survey found one in five Americans have been victims of ransomware.² The COVID-19 pandemic created new opportunities for cybercrime, including COVID-related phishing and malware, with 35.9% of the world’s COVID-19 cyber threats occurring in the United States.³ Cyber attackers mainly rely on phishing attacks, which is the most common attack as measured by the number of victims.⁴ Attackers also use online tools for extortion, data breaches, identity theft, extracting ransoms, email compromise schemes, impersonating charities and government actors, and other schemes.⁵ Researchers attribute the rise in attacks to the increase in remote work and the lower security protections at one’s home compared to an office.⁶

Cybercrime is costly and harms individuals, government entities, and businesses across a broad range of industries. The average data breach in 2020 cost companies \$3.83

million dollars.⁷ Email compromise schemes, in which email accounts are compromised to conduct unauthorized transfers of funds, accounted for over \$1.8 billion in losses in 2020.⁸ In the first six months of 2021, six ransomware organizations hacked 292 organizations and stole \$45 million dollars.⁹ Organizations that experienced cybercrime this year include the Colonial Pipeline, the Steamship Authority of Massachusetts, JBS Foods, and the Washington D.C. Metropolitan Police Department.¹⁰ As shown by the gas shortage due to the Colonial Pipeline breach, these attacks can shut down critical infrastructure, create shortages, increase the cost of goods and services, and cost organizations money from both operational shutdowns and paying ransoms to hackers.¹¹ Likewise, the December 2020, SolarWinds attack targeted SolarWinds’ 300,000 customers and endangered the cybersecurity of many federal government agencies, including the Department of Defense, as well as 425 of the U.S. Fortune 500 companies.¹² Cybercrime harms businesses across all industries, but it had a particular effect on companies responding to the COVID-19 pandemic by disrupting COVID-19 supply chains and the government’s efforts to address the spreading virus.¹³

Bad actors gravitate to cyber-attacks because of the anonymity the internet provides and the low chances of getting caught. The detection and prosecution rate of cyber criminals in the United States is .05%.¹⁴ Given the difficulty in tracing and prosecuting these crimes, it is important to further study and track them so that we can work to prevent cybercrime. H.R. 4977, the Better Cybercrime Metrics Act will provide law enforcement with the tools to uniformly classify and track cybercrime, furthering the government’s understanding of this serious problem and building the foundation for improved cybercrime prevention efforts.

B. SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS FOR THE AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE

Section 1. Short Title. Section 1 sets forth the short title of the bill as the “Better Cybercrime Metrics Act.”

Section 2. Cybercrime Taxonomy. Section 2 requires, within 90 days of the passage of the Act, the DOJ and the National Academy of Sciences to develop a taxonomy that can be used by law enforcement to categorize and track cybercrime, and requires that the taxonomy be presented to Congress. The bill authorizes \$1,000,000 to carry out this section.

Section 3. Cybercrime Reporting. Section 3 requires, not later than 2 years after the passage of the Act, the DOJ to establish a category in the National Incident-Based Reporting System to enable the collection of cybercrime and cyber-enabled crime reports from Federal, State, and local officials, incorporating the taxonomy developed under Section 2 as appropriate.

Section 4. National Crime Victimization Survey. Section 4 requires cybercrime to be added to the National Crime Victimization Survey. The bill authorizes \$2,000,000 to carry out this section.

Section 5. GAO Study on Cybercrime Metrics. Section 5 directs the GAO to do a study on the current reporting mechanisms of cybercrime and the disparities in data between (A) data relating to cybercrime and cyber-enabled crime; and (B) other types of crime data.

ENDNOTES

¹Fed. Bureau of Investigation, Internet Crime Complaint Ctr., Internet Crime Report 2020 19 (2021) https://www.ic3.gov/Media/PDF/AnnualReport/2020_IC3Report.pdf.

²Joe Francella, *Anomali Harris Poll: Ransomware Hits 1 in 5 Americans*, Anomali (Aug. 16, 2019), <https://www.anomali.com/>

blog/anomali-harris-poll-ransomware-hits-1-in-5.

³Trend Micro Research, Attacks from All Angles: 2021 Midyear Cybersecurity Report 23 (2021) <https://documents.trendmicro.com/assets/rpt/rpt-attacks-from-all-angles.pdf>.

⁴Fed. Bureau of Investigation, Internet Crime Complaint Ctr., Internet Crime Report 2020 6 (2021) https://www.ic3.gov/Media/PDF/AnnualReport/2020_IC3Report.pdf.

⁵*Id.* at 19.

⁶*The 10 Biggest Ransomware Attacks of 2021*, Touro College Illinois (Nov. 12, 2021), <https://illinois.touro.edu/news/the-10-biggest-ransomware-attacks-of-2021.php>.

⁷Ken Brisco, *Cost of a Data Breach: Behind the Numbers of a Cybersecurity Response Plan*, Secureworks (Jul. 27, 2021), <https://www.secureworks.com/blog/data-breach-response-planning-cyber-threat-intelligence>.

⁸Fed. Bureau of Investigation, Internet Crime Complaint Ctr., Internet Crime Report 2020 10 (2021) https://www.ic3.gov/Media/PDF/AnnualReport/2020_IC3Report.pdf.

⁹*Six Ransomware Gangs Claim 290+ New Victims in 2021, Potentially Reaping \$45 Million for the Hackers*, eSentire, <https://www.esentire.com/resources/library/six-ransomware-gangs-claim-290-new-victims-in-2021-potentially-reaping-45-million-for-the-hackers> (last visited Dec. 3, 2021).

¹⁰*The 10 Biggest Ransomware Attacks of 2021*, Touro College Illinois (Nov. 12, 2021), <https://illinois.touro.edu/news/the-10-biggest-ransomware-attacks-of-2021.php>.

¹¹*Id.*

¹²Jake Williams, *What You Need to Know About the SolarWinds Supply-Chain Attack*, SANS Institute (Dec. 15, 2020) <https://www.sans.org/blog/what-you-need-to-know-about-the-solarwinds-supply-chain-attack>.

¹³Jackie Drees, *Cyberattacks on COVID-19 vaccine supply chain much larger than initially thought, IBM says*, Becker’s Hospital Review (Apr. 30, 2021) <https://www.beckershospitalreview.com/cybersecurity/cyberattacks-on-covid-19-vaccine-supply-chain-much-larger-than-initially-thought-ibm-savs.html>.

¹⁴Mieke Eoyang, Alison Peters, Ishan Mehta, Brandon Gaskew, *To Catch a Hacker: Toward a comprehensive strategy to identify, pursue, and punish malicious cyber actors*, Third Way (Dec. 3, 2021) <https://www.thirdway.org/report/to-catch-a-hacker-toward-a-comprehensive-strategy-to-identify-pursue-and-punish-malicious-cyber-actors>.

Mr. BENTZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, American businesses and American citizens face a growing number of cybercrimes. Cybercrime is a particularly complicated form of criminal conduct and one that costs Americans billions of dollars a year in theft.

This bill would require the Attorney General to enter into an agreement with the National Academy of Sciences to develop a method for categorizing different types of cybercrime. The Attorney General would also establish a cybercrime category in the National Incident-Based Reporting System so that States can better report cybercrime data to the Federal Government.

The bill would also require the Bureau of Justice Statistics to include cybercrime victimization questions in the National Crime Victimization Survey. There is no question that we must do more to bring cybercriminals to justice.

In August of 2021, the Biden administration released a notorious Russian cybercriminal early from Federal custody. The individual is described as, “one of the most connected and skilled malicious hackers ever apprehended by the U.S. authorities.” And for unknown reasons, the administration let him out of Federal prison early and shipped him back to Moscow.

We have asked the Biden administration’s Justice Department for more information about this early release of this cybercriminal, but we have received nothing as of yet. Similarly, we don’t have enough information to determine whether this legislation will bring more cybercriminals to justice. We haven’t heard from relevant stakeholders on these issues, and we haven’t held hearings with experts to determine whether this is the right step at this time.

This bill would require GAO to submit a report to Congress that assesses the effectiveness of reporting mechanisms for cybercrime and disparities in reporting data between cybercrime and other types of crime.

Why aren’t we starting with that?

Why are we making changes to cybercrime reporting mechanisms before the GAO can evaluate whether the existing reporting mechanisms are effective?

It makes more sense for us to have hearings, evaluate GAO’s findings, and hear from experts. Then we can examine whether the other provisions of this bill are necessary and appropriate.

In another instance of putting the cart before the horse, the Committee on the Judiciary is scheduled to hear from Bryan A. Vorndran, the assistant director of Cyber Division at the FBI tomorrow. Perhaps we should have waited to see what he had to say before rushing this legislation to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Virginia (Ms. SPANBERGER), who was astute enough to be able to offer the companion bill, and I thank her for her leadership and career leadership on these issues.

Ms. SPANBERGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of my Better Cybercrime Metrics Act and its companion bill in the U.S. Senate, S. 2629. And I thank the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) for that introduction and for her support of this bill since the moment we introduced it.

Mr. Speaker, our Nation is under constant attack from cybercriminals. And with the range of new threats emanating from adversaries around the world, including the Russian Federation, Congress has an obligation to move legislation forward that can better protect the American people, their data, their finances, and their personal information.

Over the last few years, we have seen massive rates of cybercrime. Millions of Americans have had their personal

data compromised, their money stolen, their identity taken, or their safety put at serious risk. In fact, cybercrime remains the most common crime in America, and this trend was only exacerbated by the pandemic and the many fraudsters looking to scam vulnerable Americans in a moment of crisis or make a quick buck off of a global catastrophe.

Unfortunately, a vast majority of these crimes are not properly reported or tracked by law enforcement. Far too often, they are not measured or even documented. And to make matters worse, our government lacks the preparedness required to fully address the next generation of cybercrime and cyberattacks.

Our legislation would give law enforcement agencies the tools they need to better track and identify cybercrime, prevent attacks, and hold perpetrators accountable. Our bill would require Federal reporting on the effectiveness of current cybercrime mechanisms.

And it would go one step further—it would also highlight disparities in reporting data between cybercrime data and other types of crime data. This is such an important step for strengthening our understanding and our defenses against the phishing attempts, extortion, identity theft, and ransomware attacks that are plaguing everyday Americans in communities and across our country. Additionally, our bill would make sure America’s law enforcement is prepared for the next generation of cyberattacks.

Mr. Speaker, I am a proud former Federal law enforcement officer, and I understand that local and State police and sheriff’s departments are often strained for resources. And I know that their time is precious, so I recognize the importance of having their backs and making sure that we have as much information as possible about potential threats.

This legislation follows through on that commitment and it is why I am glad to see it endorsed by several national organizations—including the National Fraternal Order of Police, the National Association of Police Organizations, the Major Cities Chiefs Association, and the National White Collar Crime Center, which has a presence in Virginia’s Seventh District.

In fact, this legislation—bipartisan and bicameral—was partially inspired by the attack on the Colonial pipeline last year, something that impacted many communities across my district.

After thousands of Virginians, their gas tanks, and their wallets were impacted by this disruptive ransomware attack, I was proud to build a bipartisan coalition focused on improving America’s efforts to undercut hackers, protect critical infrastructure, and strengthen existing cybercrime prevention efforts.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives who joined this bipartisan coalition. I

thank Congressman BLAKE MOORE, Congressman ANDREW GARBARINO, and Congresswoman SHEILA JACKSON LEE for their partnership. Clearly, there is still bipartisan consensus for cybersecurity reforms and protections.

Mr. Speaker, I also thank our friends across the Capitol complex for ushering the Senate version through the process. Thank you to Senators SCHATZ, TILLIS, CORNYN, and BLUMENTHAL for your cooperation and leadership on this important bicameral effort.

When our bipartisan bill passes the House tonight, it will head to the President’s desk to be signed into law. And with a stroke of a pen, we will ensure that our national crime classification system can properly identify cybercrimes and prevent future attacks.

Once our legislation is signed into law, we will be protecting more families who bank online. We will be protecting more businesses who manage their employees’ payroll information over the internet. We will be protecting more seniors who are using the internet to communicate with their loved ones far away or rely on the internet to manage their Federal benefits, such as Social Security.

Together, we will thwart cybercriminals. And together, we will prevent more Americans from becoming targets or victims online.

Mr. BENTZ. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close, and I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1700

Mr. BENTZ. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, let me just take an opportunity to thank Congresswoman SPANBERGER for the knowledge she brings to this issue and to this legislation. We have already said that this is not a harmless crime.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD Cybercrime predictions for 2022: Deepfakes, cryptocurrencies, and misinformation, to further emphasize the lack of the harmlessness that it is. It is harmful. One sentence says it all: Fake news 2.0 and the return of misinformation campaigns. They cite in particular COVID-19. I think all of us can attest to the terrible damage that was done during the pandemic with the huge issues of the question of COVID and the vaccination. Fake vaccine passport certificates were on sale for \$100 to \$125, and the volume of advertising groups and group sizes publishing sellers and multiplied over and over again.

[From the Future, December 4, 2021]

CYBERCRIME PREDICTIONS FOR 2022:
DEEPFAKES, CRYPTOCURRENCIES, AND MISINFORMATION

(By Maya Horowitz)

While cybercriminals continue to leverage the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic, they

will also find new opportunities to attack such as deepfakes, cryptocurrency and mobile wallets.

In 2021, cyber criminals adapted their attack strategy to exploit vaccination mandates, elections and the shift to hybrid work, to target organizations' supply chains and networks for them to achieve maximum disruption.

The sophistication and scale of cyberattacks will continue to break records and we can expect a huge increase in the number of ransomware and mobile attacks. Looking ahead, organizations should remain aware of the risks and ensure that they have the appropriate solutions in place to prevent them without disrupting their normal business flow. To stay ahead of threats, organizations must be proactive and leave no part of their attack surface unprotected or unmonitored or otherwise risk becoming the next victim of sophisticated, targeted attacks.

GLOBAL CYBERCRIME PREDICTIONS FOR 2022

Fake news 2.0 and the return of misinformation campaigns

The claim of 'fake news' surrounding contentious issues has become a new attack vector over previous years without people really understanding its full impact. Throughout 2021, misinformation was spread about the COVID-19 pandemic and vaccination information. The black market for fake vaccine certificates expanded globally, now selling fakes from 29 countries. Fake 'vaccine passport' certificates were on sale for \$100–120 and the volume of advertisement groups and group sizes publishing sellers multiplied within the year. In 2022, cyber groups will continue to leverage these types of fake news campaigns to execute cybercrime through various phishing attacks and scams.

In addition, prior to the 2020 US presidential election, Check Point researchers spotted surges in malicious election-related domains and the use of 'meme camouflage' aimed at shifting public opinion. In the run-up to the US midterm elections in November 2022, we can expect to see these activities in full effect and for misinformation campaigns to return on social media.

Cyberattacks targeting supply chains

Supply chain attackers take advantage of a lack of monitoring within an organization's environment. They can be used to perform any type of cyberattack, such as data breaches and malware infections.

The well known cybercrime—SolarWinds supply chain attack stands out in 2021 due to its scale and influence, but other sophisticated supply chain attacks have occurred such as Codecov in April, and most recently, Kaseya. Kaseya provides software for Managed Service Providers and the REvil ransomware gang exploited the company to infect over 1,000 customers with ransomware. The group demanded a ransom of \$70 million to provide decryption keys for all affected customers.

Supply chain attacks will become more common and governments will have to establish regulations to address these attacks and protect networks. They will also look into collaborating with the private sectors and internationally to identify and target more threat groups operating on global and regional scales. In 2022, expect to discover more about the global impact of the infamous Sunburst attack.

The cyber 'cold war' intensifies

The cyber way is intensifying, and taking place online as more nation-state actors push Western governments to continue to destabilize society. Improved infrastructure and technological capabilities will enable terrorists groups and political activists to

further their cybercrime agendas and carry out more sophisticated, widespread attacks. Cyberattacks will increasingly be used as proxy conflicts to destabilize activities globally.

Data breaches are larger scale and more costly

Going into 2022 we will see an increase in data breaches that will be larger scale. These breaches will also have the potential to cost organizations and governments more to recover. In May 2021, a US insurance giant paid \$40 million in ransom to hackers. This was a record, and we can expect ransom demanded by attackers to increase in 2022.

TECHNOLOGY CYBERSECURITY PREDICTIONS FOR 2022

Mobile malware attacks increase as more people use mobile wallets and payment platforms:

In 2021, 46 percent of organizations had at least one employee download a malicious mobile application. The move to remote work for almost entire populations across the world during the COVID-19 pandemic saw the mobile attack surface expand dramatically, resulting in 97 percent of organizations facing mobile threats from several attack vectors. As mobile wallets and mobile payment platforms are used more frequently, cybercrimes will evolve and adapt their techniques to exploit the growing reliance on mobile devices.

Cryptocurrency becomes a focal point for cyberattacks globally

When money becomes purely software, the cybersecurity needed to protect us from hackers stealing and manipulating bitcoins and altcoins is sure to change in unexpected ways. As reports of stolen crypto wallets triggered by free airdropped NFTs become more frequent, Check Point Research (CPR) investigated OpenSea and proved it was possible to steal crypto wallets of users by leveraging critical security. In 2022, we can expect to see an increase in cryptocurrency related attacks.

Attackers leverage vulnerabilities in microservices to launch largescale attacks

The move to the cloud and DevOps will result in a new form of cybercrime. With microservices becoming the leading method for application development, and microservices architecture being embraced by Cloud Service Providers (CSPs), attackers are using vulnerabilities found in microservices to launch their attacks. We can also expect to see large scale attacks targeting CSPs.

Deepfake technology weaponized

Techniques for fake video or audio are now advanced enough to be weaponized and used to create targeted content to manipulate opinions, stock prices or worse. As in the case of other mobile attacks that rely on social engineering, the results of a phishing attacks can range from fraud to more advanced espionage. For instance in one of the most significant deepfake phishing attacks, a bank manager in the United Arab Emirates fell victim to a threat actor's scam. Hackers used AI voice cloning to trick the bank manager into transferring \$35 million. Threat actors will use deepfake social engineering attacks to gain permissions and to access sensitive data.

Penetration tools continue to grow

Globally in 2021, 1 out of every 61 organizations was being impacted by ransomware each week. Cybercrime through ransomware will continue to grow, despite the efforts of law enforcement to limit this growth globally. Threat actors will target companies that can afford paying ransom, and ransomware attacks will become more sophisticated in 2022. Hackers will increasingly use penetration tools to customize attacks

in real time and to live and work within victim networks. Penetration tools are the engine behind the most sophisticated ransomware attacks that took place in 2021. As the popularity of this attack method grows, attackers will use it to carry out data exfiltration and extortion attacks.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the article: "Ho, Ho, Ho, Holiday Scams" FBI Portland. During the 2020 holiday season, this article says this FBI Internet Compliance Center received more than 17,000 complaints regarding the nondelivery of goods resulting in losses of more than \$53 billion.

[From FBI Portland, December 1, 2021]

Ho, Ho, Ho, HOLIDAY SCAMS!

(By Beth Anne Steele)

If you're doing online shopping this holiday season, be on the lookout for scammers trying to steal a deal, too!

During the 2020 holiday shopping season, the FBI Internet Crime Complaint Center (IC3.gov) received more than 17,000 complaints regarding the non-delivery of goods, resulting in losses of more than \$53 million. The FBI anticipates this number could increase during the 2021 holiday season due to rumors of merchandise shortages and the ongoing pandemic.

" Oftentimes when we talk about cyber crimes, we are referring to massive intrusions into financial institutions or ransomware attacks against large providers. Smaller cyber scams run by individuals or groups can be just as frustrating and difficult for families this time of year when all you want to do is provide the perfect gift for your family. The best thing you can do to be a savvy shopper is to know what scams are out there and take some basic precautions," says Kieran L. Ramsey, special agent in charge of the FBI in Oregon.

Here's a look at some of the more common scams:

Online Shopping Scams:

Scammers often offer too-good-to-be-true deals via phishing emails, through social media posts, or through ads. Perhaps you were trying to buy tickets to the next big concert or sporting event and found just what you were looking for—at a good deal—in an online marketplace? Those tickets could end up being bogus. Or, perhaps, you think you just scored a hard-to-find item like a new gaming system? Or a designer bag at an extremely low price? If you actually get a delivery, which is unlikely, the box may not contain the item you ordered in the condition you thought it would arrive. In the meantime, if you clicked on a link to access the deal, you likely gave the fraudster access to download malware onto your device, and you gave him personal financial information and debit/credit card details.

Social Media Shopping Scams:

Consumers should beware of posts on social media sites that appear to offer special deals, vouchers, or gift cards. Some may appear as holiday promotions or contests. Others may appear to be from known friends who have shared the link. Often, these scams lead consumers to participate in an online survey that is designed to steal personal information. If you click an ad through a social media platform, do your due diligence to check the legitimacy of the website before providing credit card or personal information.

Gift Card Scams:

Gift cards are popular and a great time saver, but you need to watch for sellers who say they can get you cards below-market value. Also, be wary of buying any card in a

store if it looks like the security PIN on the back has been uncovered and recovered. Your best bet is to buy digital gift cards directly from the merchant online. Another twist on this scam involves a person who receives a request to purchase gift cards in bulk. Here's how it works: the victim receives a spoofed email, a phone call, or a text from a person who they believe is in authority (such as an executive at the company). The fraudster tells the victim to purchase multiple gift cards as gifts. The victim does so and then passes the card numbers and PINs to the "executive" who cashes out the value.

Charity Scams:

Charity fraud rises during the holiday season when people want to make end-of-year tax deductible gifts or just wish to contribute to a good cause. These seasonal scams can be more difficult to stop because of their widespread reach, limited duration and, when done online, minimal oversight. Bad actors target victims through cold calls, email campaigns, crowdfunding platforms, or fake social media accounts and websites. Fraudsters make it easy for victims to give money and to feel like they're making a difference. The scammer will divert some or all the funds for personal use, and those most in need will never see the donations.

Tips to Avoid Being Victimized:

Pay for items using a credit card dedicated for online purchases, checking the card statement frequently, and never saving payment information in online accounts.

Never make purchases using public Wi-Fi.

Beware of vendors that require payment with a gift card, wire transfer, cash, or cryptocurrency.

Research the seller to ensure legitimacy. Check reviews and do online searches for the name of the vendor and the words "scam" or "fraud."

Check the contact details listed on the website to ensure the vendor is real and reachable by phone or email.

Confirm return and refund policies.

Be wary of online retailers who use a free email service instead of a company email address.

Don't judge a company by its website. Flashy websites can be set up and taken down quickly.

Do not click on links or provide personal or financial information to an unsolicited email or social media post.

Secure credit card accounts, even rewards accounts, with strong passwords or passphrases. Change passwords or passphrases regularly.

Make charitable contributions directly, rather than through an intermediary, and pay via credit card or check. Avoid cash donations, if possible.

Only purchase gift cards directly from a trusted merchant.

Make sure anti-virus/malware software is up to date and block pop-up windows.

What to Do if You Are a Victim:

If you are a victim of an online scam, the FBI recommends taking the following actions:

Report the activity to the Internet Crime Complaint Center at IC3.gov, regardless of dollar loss. Provide all relevant information in the complaint.

Contact your financial institution immediately upon discovering any fraudulent or suspicious activity and direct them to stop or reverse the transactions.

Ask your financial institution to contact the corresponding financial institution where the fraudulent or suspicious transfer was sent.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the article: "Without major changes, more Ameri-

cans can be victims of online crime" The Hill. "When you turn on the TV or read the newspaper, it is hard to ignore headlines: 'Colonial Pipeline a Victim of Massive Ransomware Attack.' '50 Million People Affected by T-Mobile Data Breach.' 'Hackers Exploit SolarWinds to Spy on U.S. Government Agencies.'"

[From The Hill, Aug. 30, 2021]

WITHOUT MAJOR CHANGES, MORE AMERICANS COULD BE VICTIMS OF ONLINE CRIME

(By Rep. Abigail Spanberger (D-VA))

When you turn on the TV or read the newspaper, it's hard to ignore the headlines: "Colonial Pipeline a Victim of Massive Ransomware Attack." "50 Million People Affected by T-Mobile Data Breach." "Hackers Exploit SolarWinds to Spy on U.S. Government Agencies."

These major attacks represent a serious threat to our economy and our national security. After the Colonial Pipeline attack impacted thousands of our neighbors in Central Virginia, I was adamant about how our government must vastly improve its efforts to undercut the activity of hackers, protect critical infrastructure, and strengthen our cybercrime prevention efforts.

But the story of cybercrime in 2021 goes far beyond these news-making cyberattacks—it extends into our communities, our neighborhoods, and our homes.

If you are a family banking online, a business managing your employees' payroll information, or a senior accessing federal benefits on the internet, you are no stranger to thinking about how a cyber breach or attack could affect you. Even worse, you might already be one of the millions of Americans whose personal data has been compromised, money or identity stolen, or safety put at risk.

In 2018, Gallup found that nearly one in four U.S. households has been a victim of cybercrime—making it the most common crime in America. To confront cybercriminals and their enablers, we need to have a better understanding of these incidents. However, many of these cases—a vast majority of these crimes—are not properly reported or tracked by law enforcement. Often, they are not measured at all.

By some estimates, the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) may only collect about one in 90 of all cybercrime incidents in its Internet Crime Complaint Center (IC3) database. The lack of information about cyber and cyber-enabled crime is divorced from what Americans are actually facing on a day-to-day basis an increased risk of cybercrime. What's more, these crimes are rising at an alarming rate.

Compounding this challenge is the fact that federal, state, and local governments do not have a comprehensive, effective system to measure cybercrime. In 2021—decades after the dawn of the internet age—we remain woefully unprepared to prevent or respond to the next generation of cyberattacks.

Accountability for these crimes—and protection against them—can't fully take shape until we have a clear picture of the current state of play. For this reason, we need to take real steps to improve how we track, measure, analyze, and prosecute cybercrime.

Earlier this month, I introduced the bipartisan Better Cybercrime Metrics Act, which would allow our federal government and law enforcement to better track and identify cybercrime, prevent attacks, and go after perpetrators. This bill would strengthen our understanding and our defenses against the phishing attempts, extortion, ransomware, and identity theft that are plaguing everyday Americans.

As a former federal law enforcement agent, I understand that local and state police and sheriff's departments are often strained for resources and time. And as a former CIA case officer, I recognize the importance of gathering as much information as possible about potential threats—so that we can prevent attacks on American citizens and American businesses.

If signed into law, the Better Cybercrime Metrics Act would improve our cybercrime metrics, anticipate future trends, and make sure law enforcement has the tools and resources they need.

Our bill would require federal reporting on the effectiveness of current cybercrime mechanisms and highlight disparities in reporting data between cybercrime data and other types of crime data.

Additionally, it would require the National Crime Victimization Survey to ask questions related to cybercrime in its surveys—and it would make sure that the FBI's National Incident Based Reporting System include cybercrime reports from federal, state, and local officials.

Notably, our bill would also require the U.S. Department of Justice to contract with the National Academy of Sciences to develop a standard taxonomy for cybercrime. These metrics could be used by law enforcement across the board.

I was proud to introduce this legislation alongside my colleagues U.S. Reps. Blake Moore (R-Utah), Andrew Garbarino (R-N.Y.), and Sheila Jackson Lee (D-Texas). Clearly, there is consensus for these reforms and protections across the political spectrum.

In the Senate, a companion bill is being led by Sen. Brian Schatz (D-Hawaii). Joining him are Thom Tillis (R-N.C.), John Cornyn (R-Texas), and Richard Blumenthal (D-Conn.). I am proud to have their partnership on this important, bicameral effort.

With this legislation and an improved understanding of the threats ahead, we can prevent more Americans from becoming targets—or victims—online.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the article titled: "U.S. Military Has Acted Against Ransomware Groups, General Acknowledges."

[From the New York Times, December 5, 2021]

U.S. MILITARY HAS ACTED AGAINST RANSOMWARE GROUPS, GENERAL ACKNOWLEDGES

(By Julian E. Barnes)

SIMI VALLEY, CALIF.—The U.S. military has taken actions against ransomware groups as part of its surge against organizations launching attacks against American companies, the nation's top cyberwarrior said on Saturday, the first public acknowledgment of offensive measures against such organizations.

Gen. Paul M. Nakasone, the head of U.S. Cyber Command and the director of the National Security Agency, said that nine months ago, the government saw ransomware attacks as the responsibility of law enforcement.

But the attacks on Colonial Pipeline and JBS beef plants demonstrated that the criminal organizations behind them have been "impacting our critical infrastructure," General Nakasone said.

In response, the government is taking a more aggressive, better coordinated approach against this threat, abandoning its previous hands-off stance. Cyber Command, the N.S.A. and other agencies have poured resources into gathering intelligence on the ransomware groups and sharing that better understanding across the government and with international partners.

"The first thing we have to do is to understand the adversary and their insights better than we've ever understood them before," General Nakasone said in an interview on the sidelines of the Reagan National Defense Forum, a gathering of national security officials.

General Nakasone would not describe the actions taken by his commands, nor what ransomware groups were targeted. But he said one of the goals was to "impose costs," which is the term military officials use to describe punitive cyberoperations.

"Before, during and since, with a number of elements of our government, we have taken actions and we have imposed costs," General Nakasone said. "That's an important piece that we should always be mindful of."

In September, Cyber Command diverted traffic around servers being used by the Russia-based REvil ransomware group, officials briefed on the operation have said. The operation came after government hackers from an allied country penetrated the servers, making it more difficult for the group to collect ransoms. After REvil detected the U.S. action, it shut down at least temporarily. That Cyber Command operation was reported last month by The Washington Post.

Cyber Command and the N.S.A. also assisted the F.B.I. and the Justice Department in their efforts to seize and recover much of the cryptocurrency ransom paid by Colonial Pipeline. The Bitcoin payment was originally demanded by the Russian ransomware group known as DarkSide.

The first known operation against a ransomware group by Cyber Command came before the 2020 election, when officials feared a network of computers known as TrickBot could be used to disrupt voting.

Government officials have disagreed about how effective the stepped-up actions against ransomware groups have been. National Security Council officials have said activities by Russian groups have declined. The F.B.I. has been skeptical. Some outside groups saw a lull but predicted the ransomware groups would rebrand and come back in force.

Asked if the United States had gotten better at defending itself from ransomware groups, General Nakasone said the country was "on an upward trajectory." But adversaries modify their operations and continue to try to attack, he said.

"We know much more about what our adversaries can and might do to us. This is an area where vigilance is really important," he said, adding that "we can't take our eye off it."

Since taking over in May 2018, General Nakasone has worked to increase the pace of cyberoperations, focusing first on more robust defenses against foreign influence operations in the 2018 and 2020 elections. He has said that his commands have been able to draw broad lessons from those operations, which were seen as successful, and others.

"Take a look at the broad perspective of adversaries that we've gone after over a period of five-plus years: It's been nation-states, it's been proxies, it's been criminals, it's been a whole wide variety of folks that each require a different strategy," he said. "The fundamental piece that makes us successful against any adversary are speed, agility and unity of effort. You have to have those three."

Last year's discovery of the SolarWinds hacking, in which Russian intelligence agents implanted software in the supply chain, giving them potential access to scores of government networks and thousands of business networks, was made by a private company and exposed flaws in America's domestic cyberdefenses. The N.S.A.'s Cybersecurity Collaboration Center was set up to

improve information sharing between the government and industry and to better detect future intrusions, General Nakasone said, although industry officials say more needs to be done to improve the flow of intelligence.

General Nakasone said those kinds of attacks are likely to continue, by ransomware groups and others.

"What we have seen over the past year and what private industry has indicated is that we have seen a tremendous rise in terms of implants and in terms of zero-day vulnerabilities and ransomware," he said, referring to an unknown coding flaw for which a patch does not exist. "I think that's the world in which we live today."

Speaking on a panel at the Reagan Forum, General Nakasone said the domain of cyberspace had changed radically over the past 11 months with the rise of ransomware attacks and operations like SolarWinds. He said it was likely in any future military conflict that American critical infrastructure would be targeted.

"Borders mean less as we look at our adversaries, and whatever adversary that is, we should begin with the idea that our critical infrastructure will be targeted," he told the panel.

Cyber Command has already begun building up its efforts to defend the next election. Despite the work to expose Russian, Chinese and Iranian efforts to meddle in American politics, General Nakasone said in the interview that foreign malign campaigns were likely to continue.

"I think that we should anticipate that in cyberspace, where the barriers to entry are so low, our adversaries are always going to be attempting to be involved," he said.

The recipe for success in defending the election, he said, is to provide insight to the public about what adversaries are trying to do, share information about vulnerabilities and adversarial operations, and finally take action against groups trying to interfere with voting.

While that might take the form of cyberoperations against hackers, the response can be broader. Last month, the Justice Department announced the indictment of two Iranian hackers the government had identified as being behind an attempt to influence the 2020 election.

"This really has to be a whole-of-government effort," General Nakasone said. "This is why the diplomatic effort is important. This is why being able to look at a number of different levers within our government to be able to impact these type of adversaries is critical for our success."

Ms. JACKSON LEE. The roll call goes on and on and on.

I thank my colleagues for their words of support for this bipartisan legislation. I believe the time is now. We are going to continue this journey. This is not the last legislative initiative, that is why we will be holding a hearing tomorrow with the representative from the FBI because this is a growing continuing project and problem. If I might use the terminology, we will have to re-image constantly.

This legislation is also supported by law enforcement groups and those with particular expertise in cybercrime, including the National Fraternal Order of Police, the Major Cities Chiefs Association, and the National Association of Police Organizations, the National White Collar Crime Center, and the Cybercrime Support Network.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Senator SCHATZ, Senator TILLIS, and as I indi-

cated, our colleague, Representative SPANBERGER for their leadership on this bipartisan legislation. I am glad to have joined it and I urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 2629, the "Better Cybercrime Metrics Act."

This legislation improves our understanding and tracking of cybercrime so that we can do more to prevent it.

A 2018 Gallup poll found that one in four Americans has been a victim of cybercrime.

From stolen financial information, to system-wide shutdowns, to ransomware attacks, these crimes harm our families, our businesses, and our government.

The Council of Economic Advisers estimated that malicious cyber activities cost our economy as much as \$109 billion in 2016, and experts believe these costs are growing.

The COVID-19 pandemic has increased opportunities for cybercrime, with increases in remote work and the time people spend online.

Hackers also took advantage of our recovery efforts, stealing identities to file fake unemployment claims or fraudulent loan applications.

Many of the victims of these scams only learned they were attacked when they went to file genuine claims and were told that one had already been submitted using their name or business.

Sadly, cyber criminals often target older Americans. In 2020, people over 60 accounted for the most complaints of any age group, as collected by the FBI Internet Crime Complaint Center.

People over 60 also had the greatest losses, with over \$966 million lost to cybercrime in 2020.

We must do more to protect Americans from cybercrime, and that starts with a better understanding of what it is and how it occurs.

The Better Cybercrime Metrics Act will gather experts in law enforcement, business, and technology to create a taxonomy of cybercrime so that we can define it and classify it in a uniform way.

This legislation also adds cybercrime to two important law enforcement tools used to track crimes, the National Incident-Based Reporting System and the National Crime Victimization Survey.

Together these provisions will ensure that law enforcement has a complete picture of when and where cybercrime occurs, and who is harmed by it.

Finally, this bill directs the Government Accountability Office to conduct a study on reporting mechanisms for cybercrime, and the disparities in cybercrime data relative to other types of crime data.

Together this legislation will put in place the tools to clearly define and classify cybercrime, to track cybercrime, and to better understand this serious threat.

I commend Senators BRIAN SCHATZ and THOM TILLIS for their work on this bipartisan legislation. I also thank Representative ABIGAIL SPANBERGER for her leadership on the House companion to this bill. I was proud to stand with her in introducing the House companion, along with our Republican colleagues, Representative BLAKE MOORE and Representative ANDREW GARBARINO.

We must give law enforcement the tools to keep apace with new technology and to get a step ahead of the threats faced by our ever-evolving world.

This bill takes an important step in that effort and I urge my colleagues to support it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 2629.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the yeas have it.

Mr. CLYDE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion are postponed.

HOMICIDE VICTIMS' FAMILIES' RIGHTS ACT OF 2021

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3359) to provide for a system for reviewing the case files of cold case murders at the instance of certain persons, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3359

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Homicide Victims’ Families’ Rights Act of 2021”.

SEC. 2. CASE FILE REVIEW.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—The head of an agency shall review the case file regarding a cold case murder upon written application by one designated person to determine if a full reinvestigation would result in either the identification of probative investigative leads or a likely perpetrator.

(b) *REVIEW.*—The review under subsection (a) shall include—

(1) an analysis of what investigative steps or follow-up steps may have been missed in the initial investigation;

(2) an assessment of whether witnesses should be interviewed or reinterviewed;

(3) an examination of physical evidence to see if all appropriate forensic testing and analysis was performed in the first instance or if additional testing might produce information relevant to the investigation; and

(4) an update of the case file using the most current investigative standards as of the date of the review to the extent it would help develop probative leads.

(c) *CERTIFICATION IN LIEU OF REVIEW.*—In any case in which a written application for review has been received under this Act by the agency, review shall be unnecessary where the case does not satisfy the criteria for a cold case murder. In such a case, the head of the agency shall issue a written certification, with a copy provided to the designated person that made the application under subsection (a), stating that final review is not necessary because all probative investigative leads have been exhausted or that a likely perpetrator will not be identified.

(d) *REVIEWER.*—A review required under subsection (a) shall not be conducted by a person who previously investigated the murder at issue.

(e) *ACKNOWLEDGMENT.*—The agency shall provide in writing to the applicant as soon as reasonably possible—

(1) confirmation of the agency’s receipt of the application under subsection (a); and

(2) notice of the applicant’s rights under this Act.

(f) *PROHIBITION ON MULTIPLE CONCURRENT REVIEWS.*—Only one case review shall be undertaken at any one time with respect to the same cold case murder victim.

(g) *TIME LIMIT.*—Not later than 6 months after the receipt of the written application submitted pursuant to subsection (a), the agency shall conclude its case file review and reach a conclusion about whether or not a full reinvestigation under section 4 is warranted.

(h) *EXTENSIONS.*—

(1) *IN GENERAL.*—The agency may extend the time limit under subsection (g) once for a period of time not to exceed 6 months if the agency makes a finding that the number of case files to be reviewed make it impracticable to comply with such limit without unreasonably taking resources from other law enforcement activities.

(2) *ACTIONS SUBSEQUENT TO WAIVER.*—For cases for which the time limit in subsection (g) is extended, the agency shall provide notice and an explanation of its reasoning to one designated person who filed the written application pursuant to this section.

SEC. 3. APPLICATION.

Each agency shall develop a written application to be used for designated persons to request a case file review under section 2.

SEC. 4. FULL REINVESTIGATION.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—The agency shall conduct a full reinvestigation of the cold case murder at issue if the review of the case file required by section 2 concludes that a full reinvestigation of such cold case murder would result in probative investigative leads.

(b) *REINVESTIGATION.*—A full reinvestigation shall include analyzing all evidence regarding the cold case murder at issue for the purpose of developing probative investigative leads or a likely perpetrator.

(c) *REVIEWER.*—A reinvestigation required under subsection (a) shall not be conducted by a person who previously investigated the murder at issue.

(d) *PROHIBITION ON MULTIPLE CONCURRENT REVIEWS.*—Only one full reinvestigation shall be undertaken at any one time with respect to the same cold case murder victim.

SEC. 5. CONSULTATION AND UPDATES.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—The agency shall consult with the designated person who filed the written application pursuant to section 2 and provide him or her with periodic updates during the case file review and full reinvestigation.

(b) *EXPLANATION OF CONCLUSION.*—The agency shall meet with the designated person and discuss the evidence to explain to the designated person who filed the written application pursuant to section 2 its decision whether or not to engage in the full reinvestigation provided for under section 4 at the conclusion of the case file review.

SEC. 6. SUBSEQUENT REVIEWS.

(a) *CASE FILE REVIEW.*—If a review under subsection (a) case file regarding a cold case murder is conducted and a conclusion is reached not to conduct a full reinvestigation, no additional case file review shall be required to be undertaken under this Act with respect to that cold case murder for a period of five years, unless there is newly discovered, materially significant evidence. An agency may continue an investigation absent a designated person’s application.

(b) *FULL REINVESTIGATION.*—If a full reinvestigation of a cold case murder is completed and a suspect is not identified at its conclusion, no additional case file review or full reinvestigation shall be undertaken with regard to that cold case murder for a period of five years beginning

on the date of the conclusion of the reinvestigation, unless there is newly discovered, materially significant evidence.

SEC. 7. DATA COLLECTION.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—Beginning on the date that is three years after the date of enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Director of the National Institute of Justice shall publish statistics on the number of cold case murders.

(b) *MANNER OF PUBLICATION.*—The statistics published pursuant to subsection (a) shall, at a minimum, be disaggregated by the circumstances of the cold case murder, including the classification of the offense, and by agency.

SEC. 8. PROCEDURES TO PROMOTE COMPLIANCE.

(a) *REGULATIONS.*—Not later than one year after the date of enactment of this Act, the head of each agency shall promulgate regulations to enforce the right of a designated person to request a review under this Act and to ensure compliance by the agency with the obligations described in this Act.

(b) *PROCEDURES.*—The regulations promulgated under subsection (a) shall—

(1) designate an administrative authority within the agency to receive and investigate complaints relating to a review initiated under section 2 or a reinvestigation initiated under section 4;

(2) require a course of training for appropriate employees and officers within the agency regarding the procedures, responsibilities, and obligations required under this Act;

(3) contain disciplinary sanctions, which may include suspension or termination from employment, for employees of the agency who are shown to have willfully or wantonly failed to comply with this Act;

(4) provide a procedure for the resolution of complaints filed by the designated person concerning the agency’s handling of a cold case murder investigation or the case file evaluation; and

(5) provide that the head of the agency, or the designee thereof, shall be the final arbiter of the complaint, and that there shall be no judicial review of the final decision of the head of the agency by a complainant.

SEC. 9. WITHHOLDING INFORMATION.

Nothing in this Act shall require an agency to provide information that would endanger the safety of any person, unreasonably impede an ongoing investigation, violate a court order, or violate legal obligations regarding privacy.

SEC. 10. MULTIPLE AGENCIES.

In the case that more than one agency conducted the initial investigation of a cold case murder, each agency shall coordinate their case file review or full reinvestigation such that there is only one joint case file review or full reinvestigation occurring at a time in compliance with section 2(f) or 4(d), as applicable.

SEC. 11. APPLICABILITY.

This Act applies in the case of any cold case murder occurring on or after January 1, 1970.

SEC. 12. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) The term “designated person” means an immediate family member or someone similarly situated, as defined by the Attorney General.

(2) The term “immediate family member” means a parent, parent-in-law, grandparent, grandparent-in-law, sibling, spouse, child, or step-child of a murder victim.

(3) The term “victim” means a natural person who died as a result of a cold case murder.

(4) The term “murder” means any criminal offense under section 1111(a) of title 18, United States Code, or any offense the elements of which are substantially identical to such section.

(5) The term “agency” means a Federal law enforcement entity with jurisdiction to engage in the detection, investigation, or prosecution of a cold case murder.

(6) The term “cold case murder” means a murder—

(A) committed more than three years prior to the date of an application by a designated person under section 2(a);

(B) previously investigated by a Federal law enforcement entity;

(C) for which all probative investigative leads have been exhausted; and

(D) for which no likely perpetrator has been identified.

SEC. 13. ANNUAL REPORT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Each agency shall submit an annual report to the Committees on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and of the Senate describing actions taken and results achieved under this Act during the previous year.

(b) REPORT DESCRIBED.—The report described in subsection (a) shall include—

(1) the number of written applications filed with the agency pursuant to section 2(a);

(2) the number of extensions granted, and an explanation of reasons provided under section 2(h);

(3) the number of full reinvestigations initiated and closed pursuant to section 4; and

(4) statistics and individualized information on topics that include identified suspects, arrests, charges, and convictions for reviews under section 2 and reinvestigations under section 4.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) and the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BENTZ) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I support H.R. 3359, the Homicide Victims' Families' Rights Act of 2021, and urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan legislation, which establishes a procedure for families of murder victims in cases investigated at the Federal level to continue to pursue justice for their murdered family member when the trail has gone cold. There is nothing more devastating for a family to live without answers in the midst of a violent death of their loved one.

This legislation gives a designated family member the right to request a review of their murdered loved one's case file after 3 years. Unfortunately, 4 out of 10 murder victims' families in this country never receive any closure in the loss of their family member.

FBI data shows the percentage of homicides cleared by an arrest or other means has declined significantly from 1965 to today, while the number of unsolved homicides grows by the thousands nationwide every year.

In 2019, four Texas cities cleared 40 percent or less of reported homicides, according to the FBI statistics. Low clearance rates lead to low confidence in law enforcement and reduce citizen

cooperation, which led to even lower clearance rates. The backlog of cases and low clearance rates disproportionately affect murder victims who are poor, undereducated, unemployed, and Black, and without resources to pursue this with a private investigator or with an extended legal team. They are left to their own devices. Mr. Speaker, you know what that is, remorse, sadness, devastation, family break-ups, loss that can never be repaired.

Poor Black and Brown victims and their families tend to receive less attention to their cases from law enforcement than those of other socioeconomic backgrounds and racial groups, and their cases go unsolved. This, of course, however, impacts Americans across the board. The pain is deep without easing, without ceasing. This legislation is important. This disparate treatment is unacceptable as well. We can and we must provide justice for all victims and their families.

Mr. Speaker, I hope this legislation will set a new tone—eliminating disparate treatment—impacting vulnerable communities of poor Black and Brown families who never receive closure, while serving as a model for State, local, and Tribal governments where the vast majority of unsolved murders lie, and as well, help all Americans no matter what their condition and station in life and no matter where they live.

H.R. 3359 will require Federal law enforcement agencies to use fresh eyes—and I have seen this actually work—to complete a case file, review, and determine if a full reinvestigation could lead to new probative investigative leads.

This legislation will encourage equitable treatment of victims and their families by requiring that Federal law enforcement, including the victims' families in the case file review and reinvestigation process. That means notifying them and giving them hope; provide written certification to a designated family member if a final review is not necessary; update that family member throughout the case file review and full reinvestigation; and meet with and discuss the evidence with that family member if a full reinvestigation is not pursued.

There is nothing like closure. It has been shown that cold case investigations can be very effective by using agents and investigators who have never worked the cases before, and by deploying up-to-date investigative techniques. Cold case investigations help take violent criminals off the street and to bring closure.

Let me take note of the fact that the Judiciary Committee as a whole is very active in pursuing the issue of cold cases to the extent that this Department of Justice has established a unit that works on it. I would say, however, an infusion of energy and excitement and utilization of this effort would be welcomed because this is an important message and effort for our families.

In 2010, the FBI and a cold case detective began a joint reexamination of the death of Ellen Beason in 1985, whose remains were found south of Houston in an area called the killing fields. Almost 30 years later, the cold case detective requested x-rays of the body which showed that the woman's skull had been cracked on both sides from a forceful blow. Her body had never been x-rayed.

The main suspect in the murder was finally convicted of involuntary manslaughter in 2014. He was sentenced to 20 years in prison, and was named as the leading suspect in the murder of other women found in the killing fields, though he was never charged.

H.R. 3359 mandates that a law enforcement agency must conduct a full reinvestigation like the one that brought justice to Ellen Beason's family if probative investigative leads result from a full investigation. How necessary this is for mourning and very, very devastated families.

This bipartisan legislation represents an important step in fostering renewed hope for families and is supported by a broad array of advocates, including the Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association, the National Organization of Parents of Murdered Children, the National Coalition Against Domestic Violence, and the Association of Prosecuting Attorneys.

Mr. Speaker, I am so grateful to Congressman ERIC SWALWELL, a member of the House Judiciary Committee, for his passion on this issue and his astute continued effort on this bipartisan bill that will bring light and hope to families of victims who seek justice for their loved ones.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill today, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BENTZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3359, the Homicide Victims' Families' Rights Act of 2021. This bill creates a process for relatives of homicide victims to request that Federal agencies rereview the case of their lost family member once the case has gone cold.

To be clear, this bill would only apply to Federal cases of murder, and it wouldn't apply to murder cases investigated by State and local law enforcement, which are most cases.

The majority of cold cases at issue under this bill are likely to be cases arising from Tribal jurisdictions. Fortunately, President Trump already took steps to try to solve cold cases in Tribal jurisdictions. In November of 2019, President Trump signed an executive order to create the Operation Lady Justice Task Force.

In its first year, this task force opened seven offices across the country to address the number of missing and murdered indigenous women. The task force held listening sessions, Tribal consultations, webinars, meetings with law enforcement, and victims' services programs, and formed domestic violence and sexual assault coalitions.

The task force put out guidance and protocols, developed relationships with entities like missing persons clearing-houses, began training for investigators and volunteers, and started a public awareness campaign. This was all in 2020.

This legislation is cut from similar cloth as President Trump's executive order creating that task force. Hopefully, it will motivate the Biden administration to continue President Trump's good work.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SWALWELL), the author and leader of this bill. I thank him so much for his very astute leadership.

Mr. SWALWELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for her continued leadership in this area and the gentleman from Oregon for his support.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation plainly says and will plainly make so that the sun will never set on justice for victims of homicides and their families seeking closure.

I want to thank the chairman and ranking member for their unanimous support of my bill, H.R. 3359, the Homicide Victims' Families' Rights Act of 2021. I really appreciate the majority leader and the Speaker for allowing this measure to be considered before the floor today.

I also want to thank my co-lead on this legislation, former Federal prosecutor, Congressman MIKE MCCAUL from Texas, for his dedication to bringing justice to victims of unsolved homicides. His perspective, having served in the Federal courts, brought with him a wealth of knowledge on criminal investigations at both the State and Federal level.

I also want to acknowledge former Assistant United States Attorney from the District of Columbia, Glenn Kirschner, who worked with my office, after spending many years serving as a prosecutor in the District of Columbia to detail the pain and suffering that far too many families face when they see their loved ones' cases go unsolved. Mr. Kirschner's expertise has been invaluable as I drafted this legislation to ensure no victim is forgotten.

I also have relied upon my own experience as a prosecutor, knowing that no jury verdict, no criminal sentence can bring back to life a lost loved one. However, I have been in the courtroom when a guilty verdict is delivered in a murder case and I have seen the closure that the families experience when that occurs for them.

I have also met with a number of families where they have not yet seen their family member's killer brought to justice. There is a marked difference. This revitalizes the review and reinvestigation processes for cold case homicide files. Upon request by a loved one or a family member 3 years after a case goes cold, my legislation requires a complete reexamination of the file

and accompanying evidence, new or renewed interviews with potential subjects and witnesses and other methods to identify possible missteps.

□ 1715

Improvements in technology, resources, and evidence-based techniques will also better equip law enforcement agencies with tools they need to review files under a novel lens, one that would assist in identifying new leads and witnesses to solve crimes and obtain justice that victims' families and loved ones so rightfully deserve.

It also assists investigators in homicide cases that serve important underserved communities such as Native Americans on Indian Reservations, Federal law enforcement officers killed in action, U.S. citizens who are murdered abroad, or homicides that take place on Federal land and the high seas.

It will also serve as a crucial model for the States to look at a Federal law that could inspire in their own States, the ability to adopt a local Homicide Victims Bill of Rights.

This law enforcement with additional disaggregated and detailed information about cold case homicides that will assist agencies across State lines to help triangulate homicide trends and investigate and identify new leads. Valuable information, combined with existing commitments toward finding justice for unsolved murders, has led to full endorsements of my bill by both advocacy groups and law enforcement associations alike.

The need for this bill is great. And every year, countless homicides leave mothers and fathers without children, spouses widowed, and sons and daughters without parents. The crimes spare no one, whether it is the unfortunate victim, or the family member who is left with lasting shock, turmoil, and grief. And after all, murder never discriminates, nor does it prioritize.

Special care is especially needed for cold case crimes. The FBI Uniform Crime Report estimates 250,000 homicides cases are unsolved. And as of today, we have more than 3,000 unsolved homicide cases right here in our own Nation's Capital. The number of unsolved homicides that eventually attain cold-case status increases each year by an average of 6,000.

That is why I am urging my friends on both sides of the aisle to swiftly pass H.R. 3359, and to join our colleagues on the Judiciary Committee who unanimously supported the passage of this legislation.

Mr. BENTZ. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE), a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

I rise today in strong support of the Homicide Victims' Families' Rights

Act, legislation that will help tackle the backlog of cold cases and bring long overdue justice to more than a quarter of a million unresolved or unsolved murder cases.

It is estimated that every murder victim leaves behind more than four family members. This means that more than a million grieving loved ones, families, friends, and communities, are still waiting for answers.

And this is not just a problem in older cases. In 2017, the FBI Uniform Crime Report estimated that across all levels of law enforcement, investigators were only able to close 62 percent of murder cases. We can help remedy this with the Homicide Victims' Families' Rights Act.

This bill empowers families by affording them the right to have their loved ones' homicide cases examined by a Federal investigator to see if the case should be reinvestigated.

This is an important review process to establish, especially since our technological and scientific investigation techniques are constantly evolving and being improved, providing law enforcement new tools to investigate even the oldest of cold cases.

This is a straightforward, smart bill that will hopefully bring peace to victims' loved ones who are too often left in the dark.

I want to thank my friend and colleague, Congressman SWALWELL, for his extraordinary leadership on this bipartisan bill and encourage all my colleagues to join me in voting "yes."

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a national victims' organization group coalition letter of support; individual letters of support from The American Investigative Society of Cold Cases, Parents of Murdered Children, Inc., and Murder Accountability Project; and individual letters of support from the Association of Prosecuting Attorneys, and the Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association.

DECEMBER 6, 2021.

Re Support the Homicide Victims' Families Rights Act.

Chairman JERROLD NADLER,
House Judiciary Committee,
Washington, DC.

Ranking Member JIM JORDAN,
House Judiciary Committee,
Washington DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN NADLER AND RANKING MEMBER JORDAN: The undersigned organizations strongly support the bipartisan Homicide Victims' Families Rights Act (HVFR). It is our understanding that this legislation, which is introduced by Representatives Eric Swalwell (CA-15) and Michael McCaul (TX-10), is being considered before your committee.

Violent homicides affect so many more lives than just the victim. The undersigned organizations all provide essential resources to families and loved one of homicide cases by engaging in ongoing emotional support, education, prevention, advocacy, and awareness. We provide continued support to survivors during the devastation and helplessness they constantly feel while waiting for justice and closure for the murder of their loved ones.

HVFR would expand rights to the families and loved ones in federal cases by requiring reviews and reinvestigations of cold case

homicides. HVFRA would also provide relevant resources to law enforcement agencies by updating and categorizing the types of crimes that lead to homicide, cold cases. With our collective goals towards supporting families and loved ones who seek justice for unsolved, crimes, we collectively agree that HVFRA will provide important resources which will provide justice.

The HVFRA assists families and loved ones of homicide victims by:

Reinvigorating reviews of cold case murders files. Reviews are initiated upon request by a loved one or family member three years after a case goes "cold." A case is "cold" if no suspect is readily identifiable and all leads have been exhausted.

Providing a full reinvestigation using the most up-to-date technologies and investigative standards. Following a review request, if law enforcement concludes that new probative investigative leads would result, a full re-analysis must be undertaken. This includes a complete review of the file and accompanying evidence, new or renewed interviews with potential subjects and witnesses, and other methods to identify possible missed steps.

Increasing transparency in national crime databases. The National Institute of Justice would annually publish detailed statistics on the number of cold cases, aggregated by the types of associated crimes and agency. This information will assist law enforcement agencies across state lines to help identify trends and hopefully find new leads.

Ensuring reviews and reinvestigations are working. Federal law enforcement agencies would be required to provide annual reports to Congress on what is working and what is not working with new investigations. This will aide in ensuring that programs are biased towards assisting family members and loved ones find justice.

The undersigned organizations proudly support the HVFRA. This important legislation is completely aligned with our collective commitment towards assisting those who suffer following a cold case homicide. It is our hope that the House Judiciary Committee will promptly markup this legislation so that it can be received before the full House floor for swift passage.

Sincerely,

American Investigative Society of Cold Cases.

Murder Accountability Project.

National Coalition Against Domestic Violence.

National Organization for Victim Assistance.

Parents of Murdered Children, Inc.

Project: Cold Case.

Uncovered.

Washington, DC, December 3, 2021.

Re Support the Homicide Victims' Families Rights Act.

Chairman JERROLD NADLER,

House Judiciary Committee, Washington, DC.

Ranking Member JIM JORDAN,

House Judiciary Committee, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN NADLER AND RANKING MEMBER JORDAN: The American Investigative Society of Cold Cases strongly supports the bipartisan Homicide Victims' Families Rights Act (HVFRA). It is our understanding that this legislation, which is introduced by Representatives Eric Swalwell (CA-15) and Michael McCaul (TX-10), is being considered before your committee.

Violent homicides affect so many more lives than just the victim. The undersigned organization provides essential resources to families and loved one of homicide cases by engaging in on-going emotional support, education, prevention, advocacy, and awareness. We provide continued support to survivors

during the devastation and helplessness they constantly feel while waiting for justice and closure for the murder of their loved ones.

HVFRA Would expand rights to the families and loved ones in federal cases by requiring reviews and reinvestigations of cold case homicides. HVFRA would also provide relevant resources to law enforcement agencies by updating and categorizing the types of crimes that lead to homicide cold cases. With our collective goals towards supporting families and loved ones who seek justice for unsolved crimes, we collectively agree that HVFRA will provide important resources which will provide justice.

The HVFRA assists families and loved ones of homicide victims by:

Reinvigorating reviews of cold case murders files. Reviews are initiated upon request by a loved one or family member three years after a case goes "cold." A case is "cold" if no suspect is readily identifiable and all leads have been exhausted.

Providing a full reinvestigation using the most up-to-date technologies and investigative standards. Following a review request, if law enforcement concludes that new probative investigative leads would result, a full re-analysis must be undertaken. This includes a complete review of the file and accompanying evidence, new or renewed interviews with potential subjects and witnesses, and other methods to identify possible missed steps.

Increasing transparency in national crime databases. The National Institute of Justice would annually publish detailed statistics on the number of cold cases, aggregated by the types of associated crimes and agency. This information will assist law enforcement agencies across state lines to help identify trends and hopefully find new leads.

Ensuring reviews and reinvestigations are working. Federal law enforcement agencies would be required to provide annual reports to Congress on what is working and what is not working with new investigations. This will aide in ensuring that programs are biased towards assisting family members and loved ones find justice.

The undersigned organizations proudly support the HVFRA. This important legislation is completely aligned with our collective commitment towards assisting those who suffer following a cold case homicide. It is our hope that the House Judiciary Committee will promptly markup this legislation so that it can be received before the full House floor for swift passage.

Sincerely,

DR. CHRIS KUNKLE,

President, American Investigative Society of Cold Cases.

NATIONAL ORGANIZATION OF

PARENTS OF MURDERED CHILDREN, INC.,

Cincinnati, OH, December 8, 2021.

Re Support Homicide Victims' Families Rights Act.

Chairman JERROLD NADLER,

House Judiciary Committee,

Washington, DC.

Ranking Member JIM JORDAN,

House Judiciary Committee,

Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN NADLER AND RANKING MEMBER JORDAN: The National Organization of Parents Of Murdered Children (POMC), a nonprofit organization dedicated to solely to the aftermath and prevention of murder. POMC makes the difference through ongoing emotional support, education, prevention, advocacy and awareness. POMC is very supportive of the Homicide Victims' Families Right Act under consideration before your committee.

POMC has many families of victims of unsolved homicides. We listen to the survivor

talk about the story of their loved one's homicide and the questions they have because it has not been solved. Their emotions, frustration and devastation they feel, along with the helplessness that anything can be done to bring justice and closure to the murder of their loved one.

POMC has a program called Second Opinion Service that we refer families to when investigators have not been able to solve the case or don't understand why the case is not going to court. The Second Opinion Service is made up of retired law enforcement, medical examiners, prosecutors who volunteer their time to look at the family's case and they will give their opinion to the family. Most of the time these are cold cases and we will not look at an open case. The family's are relieved and comforted that someone will look at the case. This is why the "Support Homicide Victims' Families Rights Act" would be so important to a family whose loved one's case is a cold case and just the thought that law enforcement would look at it again is comforting to them.

POMC believes that the policies within the Homicide Victims' Families Rights Act should be Adopted by law enforcement agencies as best practices for unresolved murder. It is our hope that the House Judiciary Committee will promptly markup this legislation so that it can be received before the full House floor for swift passage.

For further information about our organization you can visit our website www.pomc.org, or if you have additional questions regarding our support for this legislation please do not hesitate to contact us.

Sincerely,

BEVERLY J. WARNOCK,

Executive Director,

Parents of Murdered Children.

MURDER ACCOUNTABILITY PROJECT,

Alexandria, VA, December 8, 2021.

Re Support Homicide Victims' Families Rights Act.

Chairman JERROLD NADLER,

House Judiciary Committee,

Washington, DC.

Ranking Member JIM JORDAN,

House Judiciary Committee,

Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN NADLER AND RANKING MEMBER JORDAN: The Murder Accountability Project (MAP), a nonprofit organization dedicated to educating Americans on the importance of accurately accounting for unsolved homicides within the United States, wishes to express its unconditional support for the Homicide Victims' Families Rights Act under consideration before your committee.

MAP regularly receives communications from family members of victims of unsolved homicides. We cannot adequately express to you the depth of emotion, frustration, and consternation these people feel, as well as helplessness that anything can be done to bring justice and closure to these killings.

We regularly advise families to request a formal review of the investigation by police personnel to determine if new avenues are available to seek case clearance. This recommendation would be precisely codified in the Homicide Victims' Families Rights Act. More specifically, this legislation allows family members or loved ones to seek additional review and re-investigation into files that have achieved a "cold case" status. It would also ensure that older files are reviewed under the most up-to-date investigative standards to aid law enforcement in identifying new probative leads or potential perpetrators.

In short, we believe that the policies within the Homicide Victims' Families Rights

Act should be adopted by law enforcement agencies as best practices for unresolved murders. It is our hope that the House Judiciary Committee will promptly markup this legislation so that it can be received before the full House floor for swift passage.

For further information about our organization, or if you have additional questions regarding our support for this legislation, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Warmest Regards,

THOMAS HARGROVE,
Chairman, Murder Accountability Project.

ASSOCIATION OF
PROSECUTING ATTORNEYS,
December 2, 2021.

Re. Support of Homicide Victims' Families Rights Act.

Chairman JERROLD NADLER,
House Judiciary Committee,
Washington, DC.

Ranking Member JIM JORDAN,
House Judiciary Committee,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN NADLER AND RANKING MEMBER JORDAN: The Association of Prosecuting Attorneys (APA) is a private, non-profit organization whose mission is to support and enhance the effectiveness of prosecutors in their efforts to create safer communities. We are a national organization supporting all prosecutors, including both appointed and elected, as well as their deputies and assistants.

On behalf of the APA, I am writing in support of your efforts regarding the proposed Homicide Victims' Families Rights Act. This Act will give homicide victims' families and loved ones a rekindled hope that justice may still be afforded to the victims of these crimes. The provisions in this Act will grant the opportunity for cold cases to be reopened so that new investigations, utilizing the latest testing and investigative techniques, may produce results which previous methods were unable to achieve. With the steady increase of cold cases this Act is integral to providing an opportunity to ensure that justice is upheld in our communities.

The APA remains committed to working with congressional leaders, victims' families and loved ones, and victims' rights organizations in support of this Act. We believe that this Act will not only aid the grieving families and communities but will improve the entirety of the criminal justice system.

APA appreciates your time and efforts on the Homicide Victims' Families Rights Act. Should you have any questions or need any additional information, feel free to contact me.

Respectfully submitted,

DAVID LABAHN,
President/CEO.

FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT
OFFICERS ASSOCIATION,
Washington, DC, December 6, 2021.

Hon. ERIC SWALWELL,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE SWALWELL: We write to you today on behalf of the 30,000 federal law enforcement members in FLEOA to express our strong support for H.R. 3359, "Homicide Victims Rights Act of 2021."

The loss of a family member is tragic, made more so when they are the victim of a crime that remains unsolved. It is imperative that all families have a resolution. As technologies have improved, the chance of getting to that resolution of a crime has also dramatically improved. Agencies with these types of cases should endeavor to use every modern means available to review these cases and if possible, bring the new technologies and science to bear to try to solve

them. These agencies will also be more capable if resourced and funded appropriately in this important work.

Thank you again for your leadership on this effort. We look forward to continuing to work with you on these matters and if we can be of any additional assistance, feel free to contact us.

Sincerely,

LARRY COSME,
National President,
Federal Law Enforcement Officers
Association.

Mr. BENTZ. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let me thank the gentleman from Oregon for his support of this legislation; and as well, again thank Mr. SWALWELL for that commitment to helping families who are typically desperate for help in these cold cases.

Let me cite as a comparison that does not deal with the end of a case, but it does deal with the intervention of the Federal Government, the FBI, in particular, on a child predator case in a local neighborhood, where local law enforcement were doing their very best.

But when we were able to reach out to the FBI, although the case was not cold in its conclusion, it was cold in its investigation, its current investigation, and the FBI did bring new and fresh eyes to help us with that terrible case.

So when we have cases that are a cold case, the backlog of cold case murders continues to grow, and I think this legislation means a lot to these families. When they grow cold, this means that thousands of murderers evade prosecution and continue to walk the streets, able to commit more crimes and possibly more murders, while thousands of mothers, fathers, husbands, wives, sons, and daughters, have yet to find closure in the loss of their loved ones.

And let me just say, Mr. Speaker, I think you realize, that pain is so deep, and it never goes away. That is why this bill is so important. This legislation would result in more closed cases, justice for victims, closure for their families, and greater faith in law enforcement.

Mr. Speaker, again I want to indicate that this bill is important. I thank my colleagues for supporting this bill in a bipartisan manner, and I ask them to join me in supporting this bill today.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I support H.R. 3359, the "Homicide Victims' Families' Rights Act of 2021," and urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan legislation, which establishes a procedure for families of murder victims, in cases investigated at the federal level, to continue to pursue justice for their murdered family member when the trail has gone cold.

This legislation gives a designated family member the right to request a review of their

murdered loved one's case file after three years.

Unfortunately, four out of ten murder victims' families in this country never receive any closure in the loss of their family member.

FBI data shows the percentage of homicides cleared by an arrest or other means has declined significantly from 1965 to today while the number of unsolved homicides grows by the thousands nationwide every year.

In 2019, four Texas cities, including Houston, cleared 40 percent or less of reported homicides, according to FBI statistics.

Low clearance rates lead to low confidence in law enforcement and reduced citizen cooperation, which lead to even lower clearance rates.

The backlog of cases and low clearance rates disproportionately affect murder victims who are poor, undereducated, unemployed, and black.

Poor, black, and brown victims and their families tend to receive less attention to their cases from law enforcement than those of other socioeconomic backgrounds and racial groups and their cases go unsolved.

This disparate treatment is unacceptable. We can and we must provide justice for all victims and their families.

I hope this legislation will set a new tone—eliminating disparate treatment—impacting vulnerable communities of poor black and brown families who oftentimes never receive closure, while serving as a model for state, local, and tribal governments where the vast majority of unsolved murders lie.

H.R. 3359 will require federal law enforcement agencies, using "fresh eyes," to complete a case file review and determine if a full reinvestigation could lead to new probative investigative leads.

This legislation will encourage equitable treatment of victims and their families by requiring that federal law enforcement: (1) include the victim's family in the case file review and reinvestigation process; (2) provide written certification to a designated family member if final review is not necessary; (3) update that family member throughout the case file review and full reinvestigation; and (4) meet with and discuss the evidence with that family member if a full reinvestigation is not pursued.

It has been shown that cold case investigations can be very effective. By using agents and investigators who have never worked the cases before and by deploying up-to-date investigative techniques, cold case investigations help take violent criminals off the street and bring closure to families.

In 2010, the FBI and a cold case detective began a joint reexamination of the death of Ellen Beason in 1985, whose remains were found south of Houston in an area called the "Killing Fields."

Almost thirty years later, the cold case detective requested x-rays of the body, which showed that the woman's skull had been cracked on both sides from a forceful blow. Her body had never been X-rayed.

The main suspect in the murder was finally convicted of involuntary manslaughter in 2014, sentenced to 20 years in prison, and named as the leading suspect in the murder of other women found in the Killing Fields, though he was never charged.

H.R. 3359 mandates that a law enforcement agency must conduct a full reinvestigation like the one that brought justice to Ellen Beason's

family, if probative investigative leads would result from a full reinvestigation.

This bipartisan legislation represents an important step in fostering renewed hope for families and is supported by a broad array of advocates, including the Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association, the National Organization of Parents of Murdered Children, the National Coalition Against Domestic Violence, and the Association of Prosecuting Attorneys.

I thank Chairman ERIC SWALWELL for his astute effort on this bipartisan bill that will help families of victims seek justice for their loved ones.

The backlog of cold case murders continues to grow nationally. This means that thousands of murderers evade prosecution and continue to walk the streets, able to commit more crimes, and possibly more murders, while thousands of mothers, fathers, husbands, wives, sons, and daughters have yet to find closure in the loss of their loved ones.

That is why this bill is so important. This legislation would result in more closed cases, justice for victims, closure for their families, and greater faith in law enforcement.

I ask that my colleagues join me in supporting this bill today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3359, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. CLYDE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion are postponed.

PROHIBITING PUNISHMENT OF ACQUITTED CONDUCT ACT OF 2021

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1621) to amend section 3661 of title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the consideration of acquitted conduct at sentencing, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1621

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Prohibiting Punishment of Acquitted Conduct Act of 2021”.

SEC. 2. ACQUITTED CONDUCT AT SENTENCING.

(a) USE OF INFORMATION FOR SENTENCING.—

(1) AMENDMENT.—Section 3661 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting “, except that a court of the United States shall not consider, except for purposes of mitigating a sentence, acquitted conduct under this section” before the period at the end.

(2) APPLICABILITY.—The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall apply only to a judgment entered on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—Section 3673 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “As” and inserting the following:

“(a) As”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(b) As used in this chapter, the term ‘acquitted conduct’ means—

“(1) an act—

“(A) for which a person was criminally charged and with regard to which—

“(i) that person was adjudicated not guilty after trial in a Federal, State, or Tribal court; or

“(ii) any favorable disposition to the person in any prior charge was made, regardless of whether the disposition was pretrial, at trial, or post trial; or

“(B) in the case of a juvenile, that was charged and for which the juvenile was found not responsible after a juvenile adjudication hearing; or

“(2) any act underlying a criminal charge or juvenile information dismissed—

“(A) in a Federal court upon a motion for acquittal under rule 29 of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure; or

“(B) in a State or Tribal court upon a motion for acquittal or an analogous motion under the applicable State or Tribal rule of criminal procedure.”.

SEC. 3. DETERMINATION OF BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled “Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation” for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the House Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) and the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BENTZ) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.R. 1621.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am very proud to support H.R. 1621, the Prohibiting Punishment of Acquitted Conduct Act, which offers a solution to a long-identified problem within our criminal justice system.

This bill provides necessary reform to current Federal sentencing practice that allows judges to sentence defendants based on conduct for which a jury has found them not guilty.

The Sixth Amendment to the Constitution provides that anyone accused of a crime shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public jury trial, while the Fifth Amendment provides that no person shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law.

These provisions mean that the government is bound to move each and

every element of an offense for which a defendant is charged beyond a reasonable doubt during a jury trial, or that defendant must admit each element of an offense to support a plea of guilty. Absent that, those offenses are not found guilty, if you will, to the individual.

Notwithstanding this constitutional obligation, Federal judges routinely nullify not guilty verdicts rendered by juries and sentence defendants to significantly higher penalties based on acquitted conduct.

In its current form, 18 U.S.C. 3661 prohibits any limitation of the conduct a judge may consider when sentencing a defendant, even when a jury has determined that there was insufficient evidence to prove the defendant committed the charged offense; it seems clearly a constitutional violation.

Additionally, under the concept of “relevant conduct,” the U.S. Sentencing Guidelines allow judges to consider a range of conduct, including dismissed charges, uncharged conduct, and acquitted conduct when imposing sentences. Again, might I say, seemingly a very unfair direction given without limitations, and certainly without adherence to the constitutional amendments.

The fact-finding made by judges at sentencing is based on a lower evidentiary standard than at trial—that is, by a preponderance of evidence—which many scholars defined as a 50 percent chance that a claim is true.

The reform proposed in this bill ensures that judges punish defendants on facts proven beyond a reasonable doubt, criminal standard, the higher evidentiary standard of proof required during a jury trial, which some scholars attach a value of 90 to 95 percent surety.

Justice Ginsberg, a moderate liberal who became more liberal in later years, joined Justice Thomas and Justice Scalia, a staunch conservative, in his dissent in *Jones v. United States*, lamenting the failure of the Court to determine if the Sixth Amendment is violated when judges impose sentences based solely on judge-found facts.

While the Sentencing Guidelines suggested prison sentences from 27 to 71 months for the three defendants in the case, the trial judge imposed—if you can believe it—overwhelming sentences of 180, 194, and 225 months, based on the conduct the prosecution failed to prove.

Justice Scalia’s often-quoted dissent was issued more than 7 years ago. Yet nothing has been done about this unjust, undemocratic practice and, really, unconstitutional, which diminishes the sanctity of the jury trial, the standard of reasonable doubt, which any layman can tell you. When you ask them what the standard is for proving guilt or innocence in a criminal trial, everybody knows the words, “with reasonable doubt.”

Can you imagine? That is not the case.

The public check on the government's power and the overall integrity of the criminal justice system must be maintained.

H.R. 1621 would restore fairness to jury trials by amending Section 3661 to ban consideration of acquitted conduct at sentencing unless the conduct is considered for mitigation purposes.

Though I wish we were doing more to advance substantive criminal justice reform, I am happy to support this bipartisan bill that addresses an acute need while restoring the basic propositions of due process and the right to a trial by jury.

I want to express enthusiastic support and appreciation to Representative STEVE COHEN, chair of the Subcommittee on the Constitution, Civil Rights and Civil Liberties, for his commitment to justice and for taking the lead on this significant, bipartisan bill, along with Representative KELLY ARMSTRONG.

A broad coalition of advocates support this measure, including—R Street Institute, the ACLU, The Innocence Project, Brennan Center for Justice, the American Bar Association, Families Against Mandatory Minimums, The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights, and the Federal Public and Community Defenders.

It is for that reason I hope that the Senate will take up this bill and pass the House version as soon as possible.

I ask my colleagues to support this bill and to continue working on additional measures to make our justice system more equitable and more transparent. I look forward to coming to the floor with those initiatives.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BENTZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1621, the Prohibiting Punishment of Acquitted Conduct Act of 2021.

The Sixth Amendment of the Constitution ensures that criminal defendants have the right to a trial by jury. This right is so important that our Founding Fathers preserved it in the Bill of Rights. It is a hallmark of our great country and one of the many things that separates us from other countries.

Our commitment to trial by jury means we accept the jury's decision whether we agree with it or not.

This bill would prohibit Federal judges from increasing a defendant's sentence based on conduct for which the defendant had been acquitted by a jury.

In 1987, the United States Sentencing Commission established Federal sentencing guidelines. These guidelines allow judges to consider conduct that was not formally charged or proven beyond a reasonable doubt at a trial, so long as the judge finds the conduct relevant by a preponderance of the evidence.

There are numerous examples of this happening. Judges have intervened to

overrule the determinations of juries and have handed down harsher sentences after considering conduct for which the defendants have been charged and acquitted.

□ 1730

Allowing judges to consider acquitted conduct punishes people for a crime for which they have not been convicted. It is wrong and violates the spirit of our Bill of Rights.

Both Justice Kavanaugh and the late Justice Antonin Scalia recognized the fundamental unfairness of using acquitted conduct at sentencing. Both said it must stop.

In 2015, as a judge on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit, then-Judge Kavanaugh wrote: "Allowing judges to rely on acquitted or uncharged conduct to impose higher sentences than they otherwise would impose seems a dubious infringement on the rights to due process and to a jury trial."

I agree with Justice Scalia and Justice Kavanaugh.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN), the author of this legislation; the chairman of the Subcommittee on the Constitution, Civil Rights, and Civil Liberties of the Committee on the Judiciary; and a strong advocate for justice.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, first, I want to take a point of personal privilege. This is the first day that I have walked into the House without Don Young being in it.

Don Young was an outstanding Congressman and a good human being. He was my friend. Every day I walked in those doors and he sat on the aisle, I would say hello, and we would talk. This is the first day he hasn't been there to say hello.

I will join with other Members to memorialize him in the services tomorrow here in the Capitol and also at his church in Virginia on Wednesday. Mr. YOUNG was the dean of the House, just a good human being, and he had a wonderful wife.

On this bill, I want to thank Mr. ARMSTRONG for working with me on it. He was a strong proponent of the bill, and it is truly bipartisan and bicameral. It has already passed the Senate in some form, I believe.

It has been mentioned that Justice Scalia was a great proponent of this, as was Justice Ginsburg and Justice Kavanaugh.

Mr. BENTZ and Ms. JACKSON LEE have made all the arguments. I have a few pages of speeches here, but there is no reason to read them. A long time ago, I was told if you make the sale, sit down. The sale has been made, I believe.

Mr. Speaker, I urge everybody to vote "aye."

I rise in strong support of H.R. 1621, the Prohibiting Punishment of Acquitted Conduct

Act. This bill is a bipartisan, bicameral effort to prevent judges from punishing defendants for conduct they have not been found to be guilty of. I'd like to begin by thanking my co-lead on this bill, Congressman KELLY ARMSTRONG, for all his hard work on this issue.

The U.S. Constitution's Fifth and Sixth Amendments guarantee the right to due process and the right to a jury trial for those accused of a crime—these are two foundational principles meant to foster justice and fairness in the American criminal legal system. These rights ensure that we are presumed to be innocent unless and until the government proves a defendant's guilt to a Jury.

Our system requires the government to prove an individual's guilt to a jury beyond a reasonable doubt; however, under current federal law, judges may impose sentencing enhancements for conduct that they find to have been committed based on a less demanding standard—preponderance of the evidence.

The result of this discrepancy in the law is that even if a defendant has been found by a jury of their peers to not be guilty of a crime, a judge may still use and consider that conduct for the purposes of sentencing them. This means that people are spending time in jail for conduct that the government failed to prove they had committed, and a jury has acquitted them of.

This is entirely antithetical to the foundational principles of our criminal justice system and Constitution—it not only undermines due process, but it undercuts the important role juries play in our criminal system by allowing judges to sentence individuals for conduct regardless of the decision of the jury.

The Prohibiting Punishment of Acquitted Conduct Act would correct this inexplicable discrepancy by prohibiting the consideration of such acquitted conduct in sentencing by federal judges, unless being considered for the purpose of mitigating a sentence. This would ensure that no one spends time in jail for conduct prosecutors were not able to prove at trial.

It does so by amending Section 3661 of Title 18 to expressly state that, except for purposes of mitigating a sentence, a court of the United States shall not consider acquitted conduct when sentencing a defendant.

Ending the consideration of acquitted conduct is and should be a bipartisan effort—two of the fiercest champions of this policy position include the late Justices Ginsburg and Scalia.

Allowing judges to continue to sentence defendants based on conduct they have been acquitted of demeans and diminishes due process and is a blatant attack on the Constitutional rights of Americans. We must preserve and protect these rights by passing the Prohibiting Punishment of Acquitted Conduct Act.

No one should be put behind bars for something the government was unable to prove they did to a jury of their peers beyond a reasonable doubt.

I urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting this bicameral, bipartisan bill to end this un-American practice.

Mr. BENTZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. ARMSTRONG).

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Prohibiting Punishment of Acquitted Conduct Act.

I thank Mr. COHEN for introducing this important legislation.

Mr. Speaker, due process is more than an ideal. It is a fundamental right enshrined in our law. The Constitution confirms that right and explicitly ensures procedural fairness to those accused and convicted of crimes. Yet, the criminal justice system often grants judges with discretion to increase the length and severity of punishment based on conduct for which an individual was proven not guilty.

We can all agree that holding criminals accountable is essential to law and order. However, sentencing based on acquitted conduct is an affront to all Americans' constitutional rights. The Prohibiting Punishment of Acquitted Conduct Act will bring an end to this unfair practice.

This bipartisan, bicameral legislation bars judges from considering an individual's acquitted conduct during sentencing, except for purposes of mitigating a sentence.

This bill is a crucial step toward restoring some fairness in our criminal justice system and commands a broad coalition of support, including Senate Judiciary Committee Chairman DICK DURBIN, the ACLU, Americans for Prosperity, and the American Conservative Union.

I thank both Chairman NADLER and Ranking Member JORDAN for moving this bill through the Judiciary Committee.

One last thing: Judges have a range of sentences in the sentencing guidelines. Prosecutors, after conviction, make recommendations. There is a pre-trial sentencing report. Again, the sentencing can vary very highly up and down in that vein. There is absolutely no reason, in the interest of justice or fairness, where acquitted conduct needs to be used in sentencing offenders.

Mr. COHEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENTZ. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I want to say how much I enjoyed working with Mr. ARMSTRONG on the Judiciary Committee.

When I came back for the new Congress and he wasn't on the committee, that was a loss. But it has been good to work with him on this bill, and he has worked on this in the past. I appreciate it.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to incorporate by reference everything that Mr. ARMSTRONG said into my previous lack of remarks. It can be done.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BENTZ. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I thank the gentleman from Oregon for supporting this legislation. He cited a number of judges and courts who added their support to this important legislation.

Mr. COHEN's eloquence was in the efforts he has made to help those who have suffered injustice.

We thank Congressman ARMSTRONG for his work as well. The fact that they are speaking in tandem speaks loudly on this floor.

As I close, I include in the RECORD the dissenting opinion of Justices Scalia, Thomas, and Ginsburg, with simple comments from their opinion:

"On petitioners' appeal, the D.C. Circuit held that even if their sentences would have been substantively unreasonable but for judge-found facts, their Sixth Amendment rights were not violated."

That was found by the D.C. Circuit.

"We should grant certiorari to put an end to the unbroken string of cases disregarding the Sixth Amendment."

So, you are more than affirmed that the Sixth Amendment in these cases is patently disregarded.

I include in the RECORD the Supreme Court dissent on the Jones v. United States case.

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

JOSEPH JONES, DESMOND THURSTON, AND
ANTWUAN BALL V. UNITED STATES

ON PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE
UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

No. 13-10026.—Decided October 14, 2014

The petition for a writ of certiorari is denied.

JUSTICE SCALIA, with whom JUSTICE THOMAS and JUSTICE GINSBURG join, dissenting from denial of certiorari.

A jury convicted petitioners Joseph Jones, Desmond Thurston, and Antwuan Ball of distributing very small amounts of crack cocaine, and acquitted them of conspiring to distribute drugs. The sentencing judge, however, found that they *had* engaged in the charged conspiracy and, relying largely on that finding, imposed sentences that petitioners say were many times longer than those the Guidelines would otherwise have recommended.

Petitioners present a strong case that, but for the judge's finding of fact, their sentences would have been "substantively unreasonable" and therefore illegal. See *Rita v. United States*, 551 U.S. 338, 372 (2007) (SCALIA, J., joined by THOMAS, J., concurring in part and concurring in judgment). If so, their constitutional rights were violated. The Sixth Amendment, together with the Fifth Amendment's Due Process Clause, "requires that each element of a crime" be either admitted by the defendant, or "proved to the jury beyond a reasonable doubt." *Alleyne v. United States*, 570 U.S. ____ (2013) (slip op., at 3). Any fact that increases the penalty to which a defendant is exposed constitutes an element of a crime, *Apprendi v. New Jersey*, 530 U.S. 466, 483, n. 10, 490 (2000), and "must be found by a jury, not a judge," *Cunningham v. California*, 549 U.S. 270, 281 (2007).^{*} We have held that a substantively unreasonable penalty is illegal and must be set aside. *Gall v. United States*, 552 U.S. 38, 51 (2007). It unavoidably follows that any fact necessary to prevent a sentence from being substantively unreasonable—thereby exposing the defendant to the longer sentence—is an element that must be either admitted by the defendant or found by the jury. It *may not* be found by a judge.

For years, however, we have refrained from saying so. In *Rita v. United States*, we dis-

missed the possibility of Sixth Amendment violations resulting from substantive reasonableness review as hypothetical and not presented by the facts of the case. We thus left for another day the question whether the Sixth Amendment is violated when courts impose sentences that, but for a judge-found fact, would be reversed for substantive unreasonableness. 551 U.S., at 353; see also *id.*, at 366 (Stevens, J., joined in part by GINSBURG, J., concurring) ("Such a hypothetical case should be decided if and when it arises"). Nonetheless, the Courts of Appeals have uniformly taken our continuing silence to suggest that the Constitution *does* permit otherwise unreasonable sentences supported by judicial factfinding, so long as they are within the statutory range. See, e.g., *United States v. Benkahla*, 530 F. 3d 300, 312 (CA4 2008); *United States v. Hernandez*, 633 F. 3d 370, 374 (CA5 2011); *United States v. Ashqar*, 582 F. 3d 819, 824-825 (CA7 2009); *United States v. Treadwell*, 593 F. 3d 990, 1017-1018 (CA9 2010); *United States v. Redcorn*, 528 F. 3d 727, 745-746 (CA10 2008).

This has gone on long enough. The present petition presents the case the Court claimed to have been waiting for. And it is a particularly appealing case, because not only did no jury convict these defendants of the offense the sentencing judge thought them guilty of, but a jury *acquitted* them of that offense. Petitioners were convicted of distributing drugs, but acquitted of conspiring to distribute drugs. The sentencing judge found that petitioners had engaged in the conspiracy of which the jury acquitted them. The Guidelines, petitioners claim, recommend sentences of between 27 and 71 months for their distribution convictions. But in light of the conspiracy finding, the court calculated much higher Guidelines ranges, and sentenced Jones, Thurston, and Ball to 180, 194, and 225 months' imprisonment.

On petitioners' appeal, the D.C. Circuit held that *even* if their sentences would have been substantively unreasonable but for judge-found facts, their Sixth Amendment rights were not violated. 744 F. 3d 1362, 1369 (2014). We should grant certiorari to put an end to the unbroken string of cases disregarding the Sixth Amendment—or to eliminate the Sixth Amendment difficulty by acknowledging that all sentences below the statutory maximum are substantively reasonable.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I will say that the failure to address this issue for so many years has contributed to the epidemics of overincarceration and mass incarceration, weakened the finality that a jury trial is meant to provide, and undermined overall public confidence in our justice system.

I really think this legislation has exposed some incredulous behavior because most people believe that you are sentenced on the reasonable doubt convictions as opposed to additional sidebar conversations that may come to the judge's attention in terms of other offenses.

Today, we consider a simple, narrowly tailored bill that builds on our bipartisan effort to create a fair justice system. This bill will make sure that defendants are punished only for the conduct that prosecutors are able to prove at trial, consistent with the constitutional guarantees of due process and the right to a trial by jury of their peers, and consistent with the principles on which country was founded.

Before I close, I join with my colleague from Tennessee's remarks and indicate the deepest sympathy to the family of the dean, Congressman Don Young. He is a voice—and I speak in the present. His presence was larger than life. He spoke to everyone. His booming voice is something that I am certainly going to find a great loss, as well as his love and passion for not only his family and his great State but also for this institution.

I don't know if we will ever find an institutionalist such as Don, but we can certainly follow in his footsteps and his desire for order when he cited the words "regular order."

We were blessed by having him here, and may he rest in peace.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in supporting this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 1621, the "Prohibiting Punishment of Acquitted Conduct Act of 2021, as amended.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 1621.

Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

OPENING STATEMENT

Mr. Speaker. I am proud to support of H.R. 1621, the "Prohibiting Punishment of Acquitted Conduct Act," which offers a solution to a long-identified problem within our criminal justice system.

This bill provides necessary reform to current federal sentencing practice that allows judges to sentence defendants based on conduct for which a jury found them not guilty.

The Sixth Amendment to the Constitution provides that anyone accused of a crime shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public jury trial, while the Fifth Amendment provides that no person shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law.

Together these provisions mean that the Government is bound to prove each and every element of an offense for which a defendant is charged beyond a reasonable doubt during a jury trial, or that a defendant must admit each element of an offense to support a plea of guilty.

Notwithstanding this constitutional obligation, federal judges routinely nullify not guilty verdicts rendered by juries and sentence defendants to significantly higher penalties based on acquitted conduct.

In its current form, 18 USC §3661 prohibits any limitation of the conduct a judge may consider when sentencing a defendant, even when a jury has determined that there was insufficient evidence to prove the defendant committed the charged offense.

Additionally, under the concept of "relevant conduct," the U.S. Sentencing Guidelines allow judges to consider a range of conduct, including dismissed charges, uncharged conduct, and acquitted conduct when imposing sentences.

The fact-finding made by judges at sentencing is based on a lower evidentiary standard than at trial—that is by a preponderance of the law—which many scholars define as a 50% chance that a claim is true.

The reform proposed in this bill ensures that judges punish defendants based on facts proven beyond a reasonable doubt—the higher evidentiary standard of proof required during jury trials, which some scholars attach a value of 90 to 95% surety.

Justice Ginsburg moderate-liberal who became more liberal in later years, joined Justice Thomas and Justice Scalia, a staunch conservative, in his dissent in *Jones v. United States*, lamenting the failure of the Court to determine if the Sixth Amendment is violated when judges impose sentences based solely on judge-found facts.

While the Sentencing Guidelines suggested prison sentences from 27 to 71 months for the three defendants in the case, the trial judge imposed sentences of 180, 194, and 225 months, based on conduct the prosecution failed to prove.

Justice Scalia's often-quoted dissent was issued more than seven years ago.

Yet nothing has been done about this unjust, undemocratic practice, which diminishes the sanctity of the jury trial, the public check on the government's power, and the overall integrity of the criminal justice system.

H.R. 1621 would restore fairness to jury trials by amending Section 3661 to ban consideration of acquitted conduct at sentencing unless the conduct is considered for mitigation purposes.

Though I wish we were doing more to advance substantive criminal justice reform, I support this bipartisan bill that addresses an acute need while restoring the basic propositions of due process and the right to trial by jury.

I thank our colleague, Representative STEVE COHEN, for his commitment to justice and for taking the lead on this significant, bipartisan bill alongside Representative KELLY ARMSTRONG.

A broad coalition of advocates support this measure, including R Street Institute, the ACLU, The Innocence Project, Brennan Center for Justice, the American Bar Association, Families Against Mandatory Minimums, the Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights, and Federal Public & Community Defenders.

It is my hope that the Senate will take up and pass the House version of this bill soon.

I ask my colleagues to support this bill and to continue working together on additional measures to make our justice system more equitable and more transparent.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Prohibiting Punishment of Acquitted Conduct Act—commonsense bipartisan and bicameral legislation to restore a key aspect of fairness to our criminal justice system.

Under the U.S. criminal justice system, you are innocent until proven guilty. A principle that is foundational to our system of law and order.

Coupled with this principle, is that if you are charged with a crime, you are entitled to a trial by a jury of your peers. If they find you innocent, your case is finished.

This all makes sense—and aligns with our understanding of our justice system. But, in too many cases, our courts are punishing people for crimes they've been found innocent of.

Currently, even if one jury finds you innocent and acquits you of a crime, a different judge can still use that allegation as a basis of

providing a harsher punishment for a crime you are convicted of.

This means that the second judge can effectively unilaterally overturn a prior acquittal when considering a future sentence—dismissing the presumption of innocent until proven guilty.

This is absurd.

I was a litigator and defense attorney for many years, and I understand exactly how unjust it is for someone found innocent to have this ticking timebomb looming overhead.

This bill will end the practice of judges increasing sentences based on conduct for which a defendant has been acquitted by a jury—restoring a foundation pillar of fairness in our criminal justice system.

I want to thank Congressman COHEN and Congressman ARMSTRONG for their leadership on this issue, and I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1621, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. CLYDE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion are postponed.

COVID-19 AMERICAN HISTORY PROJECT ACT

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4738) to direct the American Folklife Center at the Library of Congress to establish a history project to collect video and audio recordings of personal histories and testimonials, written materials, and photographs of those who were affected by COVID-19, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4738

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "COVID-19 American History Project Act".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS; PURPOSE.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds as follows:

(1) COVID-19 is a highly infectious respiratory illness caused by a virus called SARS-CoV-2. This disease has caused a worldwide pandemic affecting millions of people and has fundamentally altered the operations of the world's cities, businesses, and schools.

(2) The outbreak of COVID-19 was first detected in Wuhan, China, and on January 21, 2020, the first confirmed case of COVID-19 was diagnosed in the United States.

(3) The World Health Organization (WHO) declared COVID-19 a global pandemic on March 11, 2020, and the President of the United States issued a national emergency declaration concerning the pandemic on March 13, 2020.

(4) To date, 194 million individuals have tested positive for COVID-19. Of those, 35 million are Americans; that is, more than one of every 10 Americans. Almost 4.2 million people have died from COVID-19 globally, and over 610,000 deaths have occurred in the United States.

(5) The first American received the COVID-19 vaccine on December 14, 2020. Since then, 163 million Americans have been vaccinated and 188.5 million have received at least one dose. The vaccine became available to every American adult 18 and older on April 19, 2021.

(6) While there are still remaining cases, and healthcare professionals and researchers are tirelessly working to eradicate the disease, it is important we begin work to fully capture the firsthand personal stories of those impacted by COVID-19, a major national event in the history of this country.

(7) Oral histories are of immeasurable value to historians, researchers, authors, journalists, film makers, scholars, students, and citizens of all walks of life. Survivors of the pandemic, survivors of loved ones who lost their lives to COVID-19, and frontline healthcare workers should be remembered and can provide valuable firsthand knowledge on how this pandemic impacted their everyday lives.

(8) It is in the Nation's best interest to collect and catalog oral histories of Americans who were affected by the pandemic so that future generations will have original sources of information regarding the lives and times of those who lived through or died from the COVID-19 pandemic and conditions under which they endured. These accounts will allow an opportunity for Americans to remember those who lost their lives and may learn firsthand of the heroics, loneliness, horrors, and triumphs of the healthcare workers who combated this pandemic.

(9) The Library of Congress, as the Nation's oldest Federal cultural institution and largest and most inclusive library in human history, is an appropriate repository to collect, preserve, and make available to the public an archive of these oral histories. The Library's American Folklife Center has expertise in the management of documentation projects and experience in the development of cultural and educational projects for the public.

(b) **PURPOSE.**—It is the purpose of this Act to create a new federally sponsored, authorized, and funded project that will coordinate at a national level the collection of video and audio recordings of personal histories and testimonials, written materials, and photographs of Americans who contracted COVID-19, individuals who lost family members and friends to COVID-19, and healthcare workers who fought to treat the illness. These stories will inform, assist, and encourage local efforts to preserve the stories of this pandemic and the ones who lost their battle to the pandemic.

SEC. 3. ESTABLISHMENT OF PROJECT AT AMERICAN FOLKLIFE CENTER TO COLLECT VIDEO AND AUDIO RECORDINGS, WRITTEN MATERIALS, AND PHOTOGRAPHS OF INDIVIDUALS AFFECTED BY COVID-19.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Director of the American Folklife Center at the Library of Congress shall establish a history project to be known as the "COVID-19 American History Project" (hereafter referred to as the "Project") to—

(1) collect video and audio recordings of personal histories and testimonials of individuals who contracted COVID-19, individuals who lost family members to COVID-19, and frontline healthcare workers who fought to treat the illness;

(2) create a collection of the recordings obtained (including a catalog and index) which

will be available for public use through the National Digital Library of the Library of Congress and such other methods as the Director considers appropriate, to the extent feasible and subject to available resources; and

(3) solicit, reproduce, and collect written materials (such as letters and diaries) and photographs relevant to the personal histories of individuals who contracted COVID-19, individuals who lost family members and friends to COVID-19, and frontline healthcare workers who fought to treat the illness, and catalog such materials in a manner the Director considers appropriate, consistent with and complimentary to the efforts described in paragraphs (1) and (2).

(b) **USE OF AND CONSULTATION WITH OTHER ENTITIES.**—The Director may carry out the activities described in paragraphs (1) and (3) of subsection (a) through agreements and partnerships entered into with other government and private entities, and may otherwise consult with interested persons (within the limits of available resources) and develop appropriate guidelines and arrangements for soliciting, acquiring, and making available recordings, written materials, and photographs under the Project. The recordings, written materials, and photographs shall be available on the Library of Congress website and may be used to educate the public on the impacts COVID-19 has on everyday Americans.

(c) **TIMING.**—As soon as practicable after the enactment of this Act, the Director shall begin collecting video and audio recordings under subsection (a)(1).

SEC. 4. PRIVATE SUPPORT.

(a) **ACCEPTANCE OF DONATIONS.**—The Librarian of Congress may solicit and accept donations of funds and in-kind contributions to carry out the Project, subject to subsection (c).

(b) **ESTABLISHMENT OF SEPARATE GIFT ACCOUNT.**—There is established in the Treasury (among the accounts of the Library of Congress) a gift account for the Project.

(c) **DEDICATION OF FUNDS.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law—

(1) any funds donated to the Librarian of Congress to carry out the Project shall be deposited entirely into the gift account established under subsection (b);

(2) the funds contained in such account shall be available only to the extent and in the amounts provided in advance in appropriations Acts;

(3) the funds contained in such account shall be used solely to carry out the Project; and

(4) the Librarian of Congress may not deposit into such account any funds donated to the Librarian which are not donated for the exclusive purpose of carrying out the Project.

SEC. 5. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this Act—

(1) \$250,000 for fiscal year 2023; and

(2) such sums as may be necessary for each succeeding fiscal year, except that no funds are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this Act for any fiscal year which begins after the expiration of the 3-year period beginning on the date of the termination of the declaration of the public health emergency declared by the Secretary of Health and Human Services pursuant to section 319 of the Public Health Service Act on January 31, 2020, entitled "Determination that a Public Health Emergency Exists Nationwide as the Result of the 2019 Novel Coronavirus".

SEC. 6. DETERMINATION OF BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory

Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled "Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation" for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the House Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. SCANLON) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the measure under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4738 establishes a COVID-19 history program within the Library of Congress' American Folklife Center.

March 11 of this year marked the second anniversary of the World Health Organization's official designation of COVID-19 as a pandemic. Since then, more than 6 million people worldwide have succumbed to the disease, almost a million in the United States alone, and hundreds of millions more have suffered from its debilitating effects.

Experts agree that current statistics are likely undercounting the disease's actual toll. Indeed, the true scale of social and economic devastation caused by the virus may never be known.

Although the virus continues to disrupt daily life in ways both seen and unseen, through American ingenuity and sheer force of will, several effective vaccines were developed in record time. These vaccines continue to be an important tool as the fight to eradicate the coronavirus goes on.

As the country and world enter this next phase of the pandemic, it is important that we preserve the stories of those who lived through it. COVID-19 is not the first pandemic, and it will not be the last. Humanity has endured Black Death, cholera, influenza, HIV, AIDS, and the list goes on. As devastating as these diseases can be, there are lessons to be found in each: lessons of love and loss, of peace and strife, of failure and triumph.

Tragically, few know this firsthand better than my colleague, the gentlewoman from Louisiana and sponsor of this bill, who lost her husband, Luke, to the disease.

We applaud her for bravely answering the call of public service at such a difficult time, and we hope she and her family continue to heal and his memory serves as an inspiration to them in all that they do.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4738, the COVID-19 American History Project Act. I thank my colleague, Congresswoman JULIA LETLOW of Louisiana, for championing this important legislation.

When the COVID-19 pandemic reached our shores, our lives were all impacted. Some of these changes were temporary, and some of them were permanent.

Congresswoman LETLOW continues to live every day with the impact this pandemic has had on her family, and I am inspired by her courage and willingness to share her story. Unfortunately, her story is not entirely unique, and many families across this Nation have been forced to say good-bye to a loved one far too soon.

Their lives and memories deserve to be recorded, collected, and preserved so that this unprecedented pandemic is accurately understood by historians, students, and Americans from all walks of life.

Over the last 2 years, we have all felt fear of the unknown. In a lot of ways, when the pandemic hit, our Nation was caught off guard. This project will help ensure future generations can learn from the trials we have overcome and the triumphs we have been able to achieve.

The American Folklife Center at the Library of Congress is the largest and most extensive library in human history, and I can think of no better place to house the personal histories, testimonies, written materials, and photographs of Americans whose lives were lost, those who bravely stood on the front lines, and also all those who demonstrated the American spirit through innovation, resilience, and compassion.

As Congresswoman LETLOW has expressed, this project is about providing healing and hope for the future.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1745

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 seconds to my colleague from Louisiana (Mr. GRAVES).

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, over the last 2 years, everybody has a COVID memory. It might be the masks that were mandated on folks across the United States. It might be that cup of coffee that you tried to drink, forgetting that your mask was on. It might be how we have seen incredible evolution—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, against my better judgment, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. GRAVES).

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois for his evolution in thought there and for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, over the last 2 years, we have seen just an absolutely incredible experience going through COVID. It might be the mask mandates that were thrust upon people, and as I mentioned, it might even be a funny memory of people trying to eat or drink coffee through their mask, as I know I have.

We have seen this evolution in the workforce where people are working remotely all over the United States, and we have seen millions and millions of people choose to leave the workforce.

This is something that has affected so many people. We have seen multi-generational businesses close, and we have seen fledgling businesses surge as a result of COVID-19, as a result of this pandemic.

We have seen the record speed at which vaccines, plural, have been developed under Operation Warp Speed. We have seen treatment protocols that have evolved. And, by some measure, we have seen up to a million Americans that have lost their lives.

Mr. Speaker, there is so much history behind COVID-19, behind this pandemic. There have been things that have been just absolutely remarkable, like the innovation in our pharmaceuticals, in developing vaccines, innovation in technology with the evolution of incredibly convenient technology like Zoom or Webex or GoTo Meeting or other technologies allowing people to videoconference, sometimes wearing shorts or pajama pants with their suit up top. This has been absolutely amazing, watching what has happened.

But perhaps, Mr. Speaker, the most powerful impact of COVID-19 is not necessarily the successes and failures, the misfires, the things that have worked well, but it has been our personal losses.

Mr. Speaker, the sponsor of this bill, Congresswoman JULIA LETLOW from my home State of Louisiana, lost just an incredible man, a man who had a servant's heart, a man who cared so much for those that couldn't necessarily fight for themselves.

Congressman-elect LUKE LETLOW was elected to represent the small communities around Louisiana and around this Nation, I will say it again, to fight for those that were, in many cases, incapable of having a voice by themselves that was needed to change policy. But, collectively, Congressman-elect LETLOW was going to change that.

I want to thank Congresswoman LETLOW, Luke's wife, and the Representative from that area, for having the leadership, for bringing this bill up, for making sure that we don't ever forget about all of the powerful lessons learned from COVID-19, that we don't forget about all of these powerful people, the heroes that lost their lives caring for others, in some cases; those people that were on the front lines trying to allow this country to continue, our economy to continue, our society to continue.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Congresswoman LETLOW for her leadership on this legis-

lation, and I want to thank her for recognizing all the lives that were lost in the history here. I urge adoption of the bill.

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. GARBARINO), my good friend.

Mr. GARBARINO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4738, the COVID-19 American History Project Act.

I am proud to co-sponsor this bill and stand with my friend, Congresswoman LETLOW, who knows better than most the devastation of this pandemic.

Two years ago this month, an unknown virus swept across the world, taking lives and changing others forever. Our way of life was brought to an abrupt halt, and even now, we are still trying to claw our way back to normal.

Our State was hit hard and early. Nearly 70,000 New Yorkers lost their lives to COVID-19. Too many families are now missing fathers, mothers, brothers, and sisters. Too many friends are lost.

Hardly anyone has made it through the last 2 years unscathed. It is unlikely that those of us living through this pandemic will ever forget these years of strife.

What about those after us? Only by preserving and remembering times of difficulty can we ensure that future generations are prepared for what may come their way.

Mr. Speaker, the memories of our friends and loved ones lost to COVID deserve to live on. The memory of Luke Letlow and that of hundreds of thousands of Americans like him deserve to live on.

This bill would ensure that they do and that their loss will serve as a reminder for future generations.

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Louisiana (Ms. LETLOW), the sponsor of this piece of legislation and my good friend.

Ms. LETLOW. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as the House considers H.R. 4738, the COVID-19 American History Project Act.

The last 2 years have been unimaginable for every single American. As COVID-19 ravaged our Nation, we lost nearly 1 million citizens to this devastating virus.

For countless families, those deaths were not just a number on the news but the visceral loss of a loved one: a grandparent, a husband, a wife, a mom, a dad, a sister, a brother, a daughter, or a son.

My own family faced the pain of this pandemic as we lost my husband, Luke, just days before he would take a seat in this very Chamber.

Studies tell us that when a person dies, approximately nine people from

their inner circle, their family, friends, coworkers, and neighbors suffer profound grief.

This bill is dedicated to them, the now nearly 9 million Americans who live every day with newfound emptiness and suffering.

For families like mine, that loss means an empty chair at the dinner table, a son who won't be able to go fishing with his dad anymore, and a daughter who won't be able to dance with her father on her wedding day.

But this bill also values our people's personal experiences during the pandemic which will help inform the collective narrative. Their accounts will facilitate healing and give hope to the generations of Americans to follow.

The COVID-19 American History Project Act will task the Library of Congress to record, collect, and keep the stories of Americans impacted by the pandemic, personal accounts from those who survived this virus, from those who lost loved ones, and from our healthcare heroes, the doctors, nurses, technicians, ambulance drivers, and custodians who served on the front lines of this pandemic, and to whom we owe an enormous amount of gratitude.

This bill will allow us to use our voices as citizens to write the history of this time. Personal stories are powerful and can promote healing while also helping others who are hurting.

Medical research tells us that sharing a story through verbal or written means has a cathartic effect on a grieving individual. I know from my own life experiences that when we tell our stories of tragedy and loss, that is when true healing begins.

It is time for the American people to heal. It is time for us to finally put the fear and divisiveness of this pandemic behind us. It is time to let the values of hope and peace guide our Nation once again.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it is fitting for this bill to come up for a vote on the first day this House begins to reopen.

As we welcome the American people back inside their House, let us also welcome the countless stories of those we lost throughout these last 2 years.

Every day when I look into my toddlers' faces, I see their dad's amazing spirit, and I find comfort in knowing that his greatest legacy will live on through them.

But it is my children's generation and those not yet born who will need to know the personal history and indelible impact of this pandemic, and it should be written by the very people who lived it and were impacted directly.

My husband, Luke, loved history and had a tremendous passion for preserving our shared American heritage. His knowledge of the past profoundly shaped his public service.

I think of the hours he spent poring over historical documents, writing and publishing the stories of the people who came before us.

Let us preserve today's stories, not just to write a record, but to inform

the decisions of those who will stand in this Chamber decades from now and chart the course for our Republic.

It is the dawn of a new day in America, one where we can finally begin to move forward from COVID-19. And while we vow never to forget the great suffering and loss so many of us endured, we stand emboldened by the collective healing of the American spirit.

The Library of Congress' mission is to engage, inspire, and inform Congress and the American people with a universal and enduring source of knowledge and creativity.

Let us amplify the voices of the American people. Let us use their stories and experiences to write this history, and never let us forget those we lost.

In closing, I am reminded of a quote from Rick Warren who said, "Other people are going to find healing in your wounds. Your greatest life messages and your most effective ministry will come out of your deepest hurts."

Mr. Speaker, it is time for us to let our country heal. It is time for us to share our stories.

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have been in this institution now and had the privilege to serve here for over 9½ years. And that was, by far, one of the most inspiring personal stories that I have had a chance to witness.

I can tell you, based upon what I learned about Luke Letlow from my colleagues like GARRET GRAVES and STEVE SCALISE and CLAY HIGGINS and others, was that Luke Letlow was so excited to be a part of what we sometimes take for granted here in the House.

I was a former staff member just like Mr. Letlow was, but his runoff election was right at the time between orientation, where I would have had a chance to meet him, and a chance for him to be sworn in. And that is when the tragedy that Congresswoman LETLOW talked about her family facing took place.

Luke Letlow didn't get a chance to raise his right hand and be a part of this House, but his legacy will live on forever as part of this oral history project.

I cannot think of a better way for a mother to be able to give her children, in honor of their dad and her husband, the legacy that he deserves than by passing this bill tonight.

Mr. Speaker, I urge everyone in this institution to vote "yes" to preserve the legacy of not only Luke Letlow but of those whose families have been impacted the exact same way as the Letlow family by this pandemic.

Let's move beyond this pandemic but let us never forget. Let us remember our heroes, and let us remember those families, and let us remember how great our country is to be able to move beyond.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the Congresswoman for bringing forward this very poignant and important legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues as well to support this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 4738, the "COVID-19 American History Project Act."

This bill directs the American Folklife Center at the Library of Congress to establish the COVID-19 American History Project which will collect and make publicly available individual stories and records of experiences during the COVID-19 pandemic in the United States.

The bill includes a requirement to collect video and audio histories and testimonials of those who were affected by the pandemic.

Mr. Speaker, the United States will soon reach a grave milestone. As of 9 o'clock this morning, there have been 974,277 American deaths from COVID-19. In the coming weeks, we will reach 1,000,000 deaths.

However, I believe that only focusing on that horrific number, though nonetheless important, makes us forget about who we lost.

Therefore, with this time I would like to tell the stories of my fellow Houstonians who sadly passed because of this unprecedented public health crisis.

The stories I will be recounting are all courtesy of Houston Public Media, of whose journalists I have been a strong supporter.

Knowing that his daughter would be unable to walk at her college graduation commencement due to the COVID-19 pandemic, Dr. Carlos Araujo-Preza threw his daughter, Andrea Araujo, a belated graduation celebration with her close friends and family in late October. She said he really put in the effort to give her the best ceremony he could.

Dr. Araujo-Preza always went out of his way to make sure his daughter and her brother were taken care of, despite a busy work schedule at Tomball Regional Hospital. The siblings and their father spent their weekends together binge-watching movies and TV shows together.

But in 2020, Andrea Araujo was forced to spend her 23rd birthday without her father.

Araujo-Preza was two weeks away from receiving his first round of the COVID-19 vaccine before he passed away. He died Nov 30, 2020, at the age of 51.

He knew at a young age he was meant to pursue a career in the medical field. Coming from a family of doctors himself, Araujo-Preza was viewed as a loving caregiver and someone his patients could always rely on.

Araujo-Preza was the leading doctor at his hospital who specialized in plasma research, while also distributing COVID-19 vaccines to nurses.

"His colleagues were fans of him," she said. "They loved when he came into work."

He would go out of his way to give his personal phone number to patients and would accommodate their needs at any time of day. Araujo said her father would wake up as early as 3 a.m. to go into work. Araujo-Preza would sleep in the hospital for days and sometimes weeks at a time to always be on call for his patients.

Now, Araujo said she tries to live by a saying her father used to share in Spanish: "The sun always rises the next day." Araujo-Preza would tell his children to not let daily challenges in life hold them back. Because, he said, as life goes on, you should too.

"I feel like people always say, 'with time, things get better', but I've noticed it's quite the opposite," she said. "Every day gets harder."

That story was courtesy of Emily Jaroszewski at Houston Public Media.

The next story is one that is especially close to my heart: Dick Cigler from the University of Houston.

Those who were mentored by Dick Cigler would tell you he left a lasting impression as one of the most influential staff members at the Daily Cougar—a highly regarded champion of free speech at the University of Houston's newspaper.

"He taught us about the importance of journalism," said Tanya Eiserer, an Emmy-award winning reporter for WFAA in Dallas and former Daily Cougar student editor. "He really taught us the importance of doing the right thing, doing it for the right reasons; and standing up for the underdog."

Nowhere was that more evident than when, in the 1990s, a group of UH journalists wrote a series of articles challenging the decreased university budget for UH downtown students and the increased budget for subsidiary campuses.

Dick allowed the students to voice their concerns brazenly.

"He didn't try to, you know, tell us to back down," Eiserer said. "He ran interference, and they knew that we were an independent news operation."

Eiserer remembers Cigler as being a listening ear and a guiding mentor when she transferred from Baylor University to UH. She regarded him as one of the people who helped her become the reporter she is today.

"I learned how to be a journalist at the Daily Cougar," said Eiserer. "I would not give that time back for all the money in the world."

Cigler worked as Director of UH's Student Publications department, now known as the Center for Student Media, for 23 years until his retirement in 2010.

His impact on the Daily Cougar can be felt to this day.

Cigler died on Jan. 24, 2021, at the age of 79. He leaves behind his two daughters Kerri Runge and Michelle Cigler.

That story was courtesy of Myrakel Baker at Houston Public Media.

The last individual I want to mention is someone who is a local hero but should be a national one. That person was John Bland.

More than 60 years ago, a group of Texas Southern University students took seats at the lunch counter at Weingarten's Supermarket at 4110 Alameda Road, knowing they wouldn't be served.

It was Houston's first sit-in, and that spring, Black college students in cities across the country forced the beginning of an end to racial segregation—at lunch counters, department stores, and city halls.

One of the TSU students at the sit-in was John Bland, a 20-year-old who spent the rest of his life working to advance civil rights and equal opportunity.

Bland worked as a bus operator at HouTran, now called Metro, and he spent more than 50 years organizing with the Transport Workers Union. He served as a vice president of the Texas State AFL-CIO, a president of the Houston chapter of the Coalition of Black Trade Unionists, a precinct judge, and a member of the Houston Police Department Citizen Review Committee.

"When workers would doubt their ability to beat the odds and make change, Mr. Bland would say, 'When we fought for integration in the 1960s, they arrested me 27 times, jailed me, and fined me, but that didn't stop us,'" Hany Khalil, Executive Director of the Texas Gulf Coast Area Labor Federation, said.

Bland died on July 9, 2020, at the age of 80. He leaves behind his wife, Betty Davis Bland, and their two daughters and grandson.

That story was courtesy of Jen Rice at Houston Public Media.

I wish I could mention every Houstonian and honor their lives because they all deserve it. They were mothers, wives, fathers, husbands, sons, daughters, and so much more. They will all be missed and are not just another number.

It is for that reason, Mr. Speaker, that I strongly support H.R. 4738 and urge my colleagues to support it as well.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4738, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. MOORE of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion are postponed.

□ 1800

STATUE TO HONOR UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT ASSOCIATE JUSTICE SANDRA DAY O'CONNOR AND STATUE TO HONOR UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT ASSOCIATE JUSTICE RUTH BADER GINSBURG

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 3294) to obtain and direct the placement in the Capitol or on the Capitol Grounds of a statue to honor Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States Sandra Day O'Connor and a statue to honor Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States Ruth Bader Ginsburg.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 3294

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. FINDINGS.

(a) SANDRA DAY O'CONNOR.—Congress finds the following:

(1) Sandra Day O'Connor was born in 1930 in El Paso, Texas, and spent her childhood on her family's isolated Arizona cattle ranch. She lived with her grandmother in El Paso during the school year, away from her home and parents.

(2) O'Connor matriculated at Stanford University at the age of 16, and combined her undergraduate and law school curricula, graduating with a bachelor's degree in eco-

nomics and a law degree in just 6 years. She was third in her law school class, behind William Rehnquist, her future colleague on the Supreme Court of the United States (in this section referred to as the "Supreme Court").

(3) Despite her qualifications, O'Connor could not find work as an attorney because of bias against women in the law. She ended up negotiating for an unpaid position in the San Mateo County District Attorney's office at a shared desk, while her husband, John, finished at Stanford Law School 1 year later.

(4) O'Connor traveled to Frankfurt, Germany, in 1954 with her husband John, who had joined the United States Army Judge Advocate General's Corps, where she was able to find work as a civilian attorney with the United States Army Quartermaster Corps. In 1957, O'Connor returned to Arizona and still could not find work with a traditional law firm due to her gender, so she "hung out a shingle" as a sole practitioner.

(5) In 1965, O'Connor was hired as an Assistant Attorney General for the State of Arizona.

(6) Active in Republican Party politics and well-received for her work at the Arizona State Capitol, O'Connor was appointed to an Arizona State Senate seat in 1969 when the incumbent, also a woman, was appointed to a Federal position and vacated the office.

(7) In 1970, O'Connor was elected to the Arizona State Senate and served 2 consecutive terms. In 1972, she was selected as Majority Leader of the Arizona State Senate, the first time a woman held such a position in any State.

(8) In 1974, O'Connor ran for office as a trial court judge. She won and was later appointed to the Arizona Court of Appeals in 1979.

(9) On August 19, 1981, President Ronald Reagan nominated O'Connor to be an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court, to fill the seat vacated by Associate Justice Potter Stewart. On September 21, 1981, the Senate confirmed O'Connor's nomination by a unanimous vote, making her the first woman to serve on the Supreme Court.

(10) O'Connor established herself as a pragmatic, independent voice on the Supreme Court, casting decisive votes during a time when the Court was being asked to resolve politically charged issues.

(11) In the 1982 case of *Mississippi University for Women v. Hogan*, O'Connor wrote the majority opinion holding that the State could not prevent men from enrolling in an all-women's nursing school, writing that laws discriminating on the basis of sex would be allowed only if there was an "exceedingly persuasive justification" for them.

(12) O'Connor sought, when possible, to find the middle ground between her often-divided colleagues, frequently joining the majority decision but presenting her views in concurring opinions that eschewed broad constitutional doctrine in favor of resolving the cases before the Court.

(13) O'Connor put a very public face on the role of the Supreme Court, domestically and around the world. She became the Court's most prolific public speaker, traveling to all 50 States and to countless law schools, libraries, and public events to describe how the Court works and its role in our constitutional form of government. She traveled worldwide as an ambassador for the Rule of Law and the independence of judiciaries everywhere.

(14) After 24 years on the Supreme Court, O'Connor announced her retirement to care for her ailing husband, who had Alzheimer's disease. President George W. Bush nominated John Roberts, Jr., for the vacancy, but before Roberts was confirmed, Chief Justice Rehnquist passed away, creating a second vacancy. President Bush personally appealed

to O'Connor to remain on the Court so he could nominate Roberts for the Chief Justice vacancy and have more time to make a second nomination to the Court. In yet another act of public service, O'Connor agreed to serve until Samuel Alito was confirmed to fill her seat on January 31, 2006.

(15) O'Connor began her retirement with 2 goals. One was to convince more States to adopt merit selection of judges for filling vacancies in State courts. The second was to educate the public on the importance of an independent judiciary. Her judicial independence work led to her awareness of a national civics education deficit.

(16) In 2009, O'Connor created iCivics.org to educate young Americans about civics and what it means to be a citizen. That endeavor grew to become the largest civics education platform in the country, with over 7,000,000 students annually enrolling in the programs. Its popularity was due to a captivating online, interactive gaming approach. The program was free to all and had no advertising. iCivics played a crucial role in Educating for American Democracy, a federally funded initiative to improve civics and history education, which released its reports in March 2021.

(b) RUTH BADER GINSBURG.—Congress finds the following:

(1) Ruth Bader Ginsburg was born in 1933 in Brooklyn, New York, and grew up in a low-income, working-class neighborhood.

(2) Ginsburg graduated from Cornell University in 1954, finishing first in her class. Following her graduation, Ginsburg enrolled at Harvard Law School in 1956, entering into a class of 552 men and only 8 other women.

(3) As a law student, Ginsburg became the first female member of the Harvard Law Review, a prestigious legal journal. She also cared for her husband, Martin Ginsburg, who had been diagnosed with cancer, and their young daughter. Ginsburg finished her legal education at Columbia Law School, where she graduated first in her class in 1959.

(4) Ginsburg taught at Rutgers University Law School from 1963 to 1972 and at Columbia Law School from 1972 to 1980, where she became the school's first female tenured professor.

(5) During the 1970s, Ginsburg served as the director of the Women's Rights Project of the American Civil Liberties Union. In this position, she led the fight against gender discrimination and successfully argued 6 landmark cases before the Supreme Court.

(6) Ginsburg won 5 cases on gender discrimination before the Supreme Court, including the case *Weinberger v. Wiesenfeld*, which involved a portion of the Social Security Act that favored women over men, because the Act granted certain benefits to widows, but not widowers.

(7) In 1980, President Jimmy Carter nominated Ginsburg to a seat on the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit.

(8) On June 22, 1993, President Bill Clinton nominated Ginsburg to be an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court, to fill the seat vacated by Associate Justice Byron White. On August 3, 1993, the Senate confirmed Ginsburg's nomination to the Supreme Court by a 96 to 3 vote.

(9) Ginsburg became the second female justice to serve on the Supreme Court, as well as the first Jewish female justice to serve on the Supreme Court.

(10) As a justice, Ginsburg presented a strong voice in favor of gender equality, voting rights, the rights of workers, and the separation of church and state.

(11) In 1996, Ginsburg wrote the Supreme Court's landmark decision in *United States v. Virginia*, which held that the State-sup-

ported Virginia Military Institute could not refuse to admit women.

(12) Ginsburg famously dissented in *Ledbetter v. Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co.*, where the plaintiff, a female worker being paid significantly less than males with her same qualifications, sued under title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000e et seq.), but was denied relief under a statute of limitation issue. Ginsburg broke with tradition and wrote a high colloquial version of her dissent to read from the bench. In her dissent, she also called for Congress to undo this interpretation of the law.

(13) Ginsburg's impactful dissent in *Ledbetter v. Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co.* led to the successful passage of the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act of 2009 (Public Law 111-2; 123 Stat. 5), which was the first piece of legislation signed by President Barack Obama.

(14) Until the 2018 term, Ginsburg had not missed a day of oral arguments, not even when she was undergoing chemotherapy for pancreatic cancer, after surgery for colon cancer, or the day after her husband passed away in 2010.

(15) Ginsburg passed away on September 18, 2020.

SEC. 2. STATUES HONORING JUSTICE SANDRA DAY O'CONNOR AND JUSTICE RUTH BADER GINSBURG.

(a) OBTAINING OF STATUES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, in consultation with the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, and under such terms and conditions as the Joint Committee of Congress on the Library considers appropriate, consistent with applicable law, the Joint Committee shall—

(A) enter into an agreement to obtain a statue honoring Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States Sandra Day O'Connor; and

(B) enter into an agreement to obtain a statue honoring Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States Ruth Bader Ginsburg.

(2) CONSIDERATION.—In selecting one or more artists to make the statues obtained under paragraph (1), the Joint Committee of Congress on the Library shall make the announcement available to, and consider, artists from a variety of backgrounds, including artists from underrepresented demographic groups.

(b) INSTALLATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Architect of the Capitol, under the direction of the Joint Committee of Congress on the Library, shall permanently install each statue obtained under subsection (a) in a prominent location in the Capitol or on the Capitol Grounds, as described in section 5102 of title 40, United States Code.

(2) PRIORITY FOR LOCATION.—In determining the location for the permanent installation of each statue obtained under subsection (a), the Joint Committee of Congress on the Library shall give priority to identifying an appropriate location near the Old Supreme Court Chamber of the United States Capitol.

(c) FUNDING.—Amounts available in the Capitol Preservation Fund established under section 803 of the Arizona-Idaho Conservation Act of 1988 (2 U.S.C. 2083) may be used by the Joint Committee of Congress on the Library for payments for the costs of creating and installing the statues obtained under subsection (a), without regard to subsections (b) and (d) of such section, provided that not more than \$500,000 of such amounts may be used for each statue obtained under subsection (a).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. SCANLON) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the matter under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This bill, by creating statues in the Capitol, honors former Supreme Court Justices Sandra Day O'Connor and Ruth Bader Ginsburg, two women who made groundbreaking contributions to American history and jurisprudence.

The United States Capitol is a global symbol of democracy. This iconic building, where we debate and craft law, is also a museum of American art and history, with a rich collection of portraits, paintings, and statues.

Among the hundreds of sculptures, just 14 honor women leaders. By adding statues of these two pioneering Supreme Court Justices, we will honor their legacy and inspire all who pass through these Halls.

In 1869, Arabella Mansfield became the first woman admitted to practice law in the United States when she was admitted to the Iowa bar.

Ten years later, Belva Lockwood became the first woman admitted to practice before the Supreme Court of the United States. One hundred years would pass before Sandra Day O'Connor became the first woman to serve on the Supreme Court of the United States.

Born in the early 1930s, Sandra Day O'Connor and Ruth Bader Ginsburg both achieved extraordinary academic success. One of only five women in her class at Stanford Law, O'Connor served on the Board of Editors of the Stanford Law Review and graduated near the top of her class.

Ginsburg first attended Harvard Law School, one of nine women in her class. She became the first female member of the Harvard Law Review, while also caring for her husband, who had been diagnosed with cancer, and their young daughter. When her husband took a job in New York City, Ginsburg transferred to Columbia Law School and graduated first in her class.

Despite their outstanding academic qualifications, O'Connor and Ginsburg faced barriers to employment after graduation, as law firms were unwilling to hire women lawyers. Each persevered and rose to prominence.

O'Connor obtained a position as a deputy county attorney in California. Then, when her husband was stationed in Germany, she served as a civilian attorney with the United States Army Quartermaster Corps.

In 1957, the O'Connors settled in Arizona, where they raised their three sons. O'Connor started a law practice, became involved in local politics and community service, and served as an assistant state attorney general.

In 1969, O'Connor was appointed to the Arizona State Senate, where she was twice reelected and became the first woman majority leader in any State. In 1974, she was elected as a trial judge, a position she held until 1979, when she was appointed to the Arizona Court of Appeals.

In 1981, President Ronald Reagan fulfilled his campaign promise to appoint a woman to the Supreme Court by nominating O'Connor. The Senate unanimously confirmed her appointment. In her nearly 25 years on the Court, Justice O'Connor established herself as a pragmatic, independent voice.

In a 1982 case, O'Connor wrote the majority opinion, holding that the State could not prevent men from enrolling in an all-women's nursing school. She wrote that laws discriminating on the basis of sex are allowed only if there is an "exceedingly persuasive justification" free of archaic and stereotypic notions of the roles and abilities of males and females.

Justice O'Connor retired from the Supreme Court in 2006. In retirement, she remained active as a tireless advocate for judicial independence and civics education.

Following law school, Ginsburg served as a law clerk to Judge Edmund L. Palmieri of the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York. She then became associate director of a comparative law project sponsored by Columbia University before joining the faculty of Rutgers Law School in 1963. From 1972 to 1980, she taught at Columbia Law School, where she became the first female tenured professor.

In the 1970s, Ginsburg also served as a fellow at the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences in Stanford, California, and as the director of the Women's Rights Project of the American Civil Liberties Union. In this position, she led the fight against gender discrimination and won five landmark cases before the Supreme Court.

In 1980, President Carter appointed Ginsburg to the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit. In 1993, President Clinton nominated Ginsburg as an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court. The Senate confirmed her nomination by a vote of 96-3, and she became the second female and the first Jewish female to serve on the Court.

Justice Ginsburg was a strong voice for gender equality and voting rights. She authored the landmark majority opinion in *United States v. Virginia*, which held that the State-supported Virginia Military Institute could not refuse to admit women. Justice Ginsburg served on the Supreme Court for

27 years, until her death in September 2020.

It is difficult to overstate the importance of these two Justices as role models and inspiration for generations of American girls, women, and women lawyers.

Justice O'Connor was sworn in as the first female Supreme Court Justice the same month that I started law school, and I had the privilege of working with both Justices on issues of civic education and access to justice. Both women were brilliant and funny. They were stars on the bench and in our national firmament.

Now we are presented with another moment of equal significance, with the nomination of Judge Jackson under consideration in the Senate. One more barrier has fallen, and soon young women of color will be able to see themselves in future Associate Justice of the Supreme Court Ketanji Brown Jackson, as I once saw myself in Justices O'Connor and Ginsburg.

Today I ask my colleagues to honor these incredible women, Justice O'Connor and Justice Ginsburg, and help inspire our next generation of leaders by voting to create these statues for the Capitol of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of S. 3294. As all Members of Congress and every American who has visited the United States Capitol when it was completely open know, the Halls of this foothold of democracy are lined with statues to honor and commemorate the lives of great Americans from all corners of this country, all walks of life, and different political leanings.

The National Statuary Hall collection includes two statues donated from each State, and in addition to the base collection, Congress has been able to accept donations or authorize the commission of statues of other individuals who have shaped our Nation and contributed to the excellence of this country.

Such additions have included the statue of Abraham Lincoln, commissioned by Congress in 1866, the portrait monument to Lucretia Mott, Elizabeth Cady Stanton, and Susan B. Anthony in 1920, and most recently, the statue of Rosa Parks, which was officially unveiled in 2013. It is among these giants that today we consider the addition of the first two women confirmed to serve on the Supreme Court of the United States.

It took nearly 200 years after the creation of the Supreme Court for the first woman to sit on America's highest bench. Appointed by President Reagan and confirmed by the Senate in 1981, with a vote of 99-0, a record for the most votes in support of a Supreme Court Justice that stands to this day, Associate Justice Sandra Day O'Connor blazed a trail that has forever changed the Court for the better.

In the years that have followed, the Senate has confirmed Associate Justices Ruth Bader Ginsburg, whom this bill also honors, Sonia Sotomayor, Elena Kagan, and, most recently, Justice Amy Coney Barrett. I have no doubt that the legacy of women on the Court will continue.

The art collections throughout the Capitol Grounds play a very important role. The pieces honor the ingenuity, courage, creativity, and patriotism of so many who came before us. They inspire us and remind us of the extreme weight and honor of our duties as elected representatives. Congress rarely commissions the addition of statues to its collections, a practice that signifies a rare and high honor. The addition of the first two female Justices to serve on the Supreme Court is welcomed, and I look forward to their presence in these great Halls.

Mr. Speaker, I support this legislation and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. LOIS FRANKEL).

Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am very excited to be supporting this bill today. The gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. SCANLON) did a great job with the biographies of these two incredible women, Sandra Day O'Connor and Ruth Bader Ginsburg, our first two women on the United States Supreme Court.

I am thinking back to my childhood. It is not that easy to think back to my childhood, but I am thinking back to my childhood, and probably one of the most exciting things that I did was a family trip with my parents and my brother to the Capitol. Now when I think back, and coming through the Capitol and seeing all those statues, I must have wondered as a child, did women do anything? It is just amazing, of the 266 statues here in the Capitol, only 14 are women. To me that is crazy. It is just crazy.

We are honoring these two Supreme Court Justices not just because they are women. I am not going to go through their biographies again, but think about it. They went through their careers at a time when there was no Title IX, there was no equal pay, there were limitations on how many women could actually get into law school, and then if you did get into law school—because I was in law school back in the day when there weren't a lot of us—you were bullied. I mean, you were bullied in the classroom. Their achievement is absolutely remarkable.

I am very proud that future generations are going to come through these Halls, and they are going to see representations of these two women. Millions of children from all over the country and all over the world—because we are opening up, I hope soon, as we pass COVID—can be inspired, and I cannot wait. I cannot wait to bring my two little grandsons so they can see that the girls can do it, too.

Just to add, this is a bipartisan bill. I am proud to be one of the sponsors here in the House. Women did this together, but we thank the gentlemen for being on board.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. LAWRENCE).

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this legislation to honor our U.S. Supreme Court Justices Ginsburg and O'Connor with statues in our U.S. Capitol. I am so proud to hear my co-chair LOIS FRANKEL talk about the importance of our history being recognized in these hallowed Halls.

Both Justices O'Connor and Ginsburg did exactly that. They showed what it meant to blaze trails and to break the glass ceilings as the first and second women to serve on the Supreme Court, the highest court.

Their story is an American story, and it is one that our country should be proud of. It is not what you say, it is what you do, and today we are taking action.

Through their long and legendary careers, they have paved the way for countless women and girls in the legal and judiciary system. Their life-changing words and actions will live in the hearts of Americans across this country. I am grateful and I am excited to be part of the Democratic Women's Caucus that is helping to lead this effort in honoring the life and the legacies of these two giants.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would be remiss if I didn't point out a bit of irony that exists as we discuss honoring anyone by adding a statue or a bust to the Halls of the Capitol when for the past 745 days this building has been closed to the American people. Despite what is being called a reopening, it continues to be closed to most Americans.

□ 1815

This is about the last place in America to remain closed, and for no legitimate reason whatsoever. The honor of being memorialized in the Halls of Congress is far less an honor when no one is around to see it.

It is past time for Speaker PELOSI to reopen the people's House to the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. STANTON).

Mr. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of S. 3294, a bill to honor Supreme Court Justices Sandra Day O'Connor and Ruth Bader Ginsburg with statues here in the United States Capitol.

Both overcame formidable barriers and defied the odds, paving the way for future generations of women, but Jus-

tice Sandra Day O'Connor holds a special place in the hearts of all Arizonans.

Born on a ranch in eastern Arizona, Justice O'Connor brought a tough, no-nonsense attitude with her throughout her career in public service. She blazed every trail she set foot on. And just this past Saturday, she celebrated her 92nd birthday.

Justice O'Connor served as Arizona's assistant attorney general, the first female majority leader to serve in any State senate across the United States of America, and as a Maricopa County Superior Court judge. In 1981, she took her Arizona brand of independence and pragmatism with her to the United States Supreme Court.

Justice O'Connor shattered the highest glass ceiling in the legal profession, but Arizonans most admire her for the way she made it there, with unparalleled talent, intelligence, and relentless grit.

Her independent-minded commitment to interpreting the Constitution and reaching workable decisions served our Nation and the rule of law well.

One of the things that I most admire about Justice O'Connor is what she did after she retired from the United States Supreme Court. She foresaw deep divisions in our society and our politics. She knew that we needed to improve civil discourse if we hoped to keep our democracy strong.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, after 25 years on the Court, she came back to Arizona and got right back to work.

She founded the Sandra Day O'Connor Institute For American Democracy in Phoenix to promote civic education, inspiring future generations to not only participate in our democracy but to contribute to it with the same degree of thoughtfulness, civility, and grace that she has throughout her amazing career.

I have been lucky enough to work with her and the institute through the Camp O'Connor civics education program for middle school students. I saw firsthand the difference that program makes in the lives of our next generation of leaders, and I saw how much Justice O'Connor truly cares about those children and about all people.

That is her legacy to me.

Justice O'Connor and Justice Ginsburg were deeply committed in their service to the American people. They are more than deserving of this recognition.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

One of the things I most appreciate about this bill is the balance that it brings in recognizing the first two women Justices of the Supreme Court, and they have very different ideologies and views. While I may have signifi-

cant disagreements with Justice Ginsburg and her rulings and positions on certain issues, that doesn't mean her role in the history of this country is not worthy of being recognized. In the same way, Justice O'Connor is worthy of recognition despite the fact that I am sure many people on the other side of the aisle take issue with her beliefs and positions on certain issues.

Cancel culture is a disease infecting our society today. Those who seek to wipe out the accomplishments and contributions of historic figures simply due to opposing politics is wrong. I am certainly not going to engage in that kind of mentality even though I may not have cared for Justice Ginsburg's politics.

In fact, Justice Ginsburg herself spoke out against cancel culture. She was once asked how she could be friends with the late Justice Antonin Scalia. They held vastly different views. In her response, she quoted Justice Scalia by saying: "I attack ideas. I don't attack people, and some very good people have some very bad ideas."

She is also famously quoted as saying: "Fight for the things you care about, but do it in a way that will lead others to join you."

In short, Mr. Speaker, it is okay to fight for what you believe in. It is okay to disagree or even despise what someone else believes, but it doesn't mean they don't have a right to those beliefs.

Unfortunately, this contrasts with some of the actions of my friends on the other side of the aisle these past few years. I hope this serves as an example that we can disagree without being disagreeable, that we choose to rise above being easily offended and instead respect alternative points of view, and that the Halls of Congress are a place where everyone feels their viewpoints and beliefs are given equal credence.

Mr. Speaker, again, I appreciate the balance of this bill. I rise in support of this legislation. I urge everyone to adopt it, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I am so proud to rise in support of this bill to recognize the brilliant and groundbreaking legal careers of Sandra Day O'Connor and Ruth Bader Ginsburg, but I am also so proud to recognize them because of their unrelenting focus on our young people.

We have heard a couple of times about Justice O'Connor's interest in civics education. She founded her civics nonprofit when she found that more Americans knew the names of the judges on "American Idol" than they did the Justices of the Supreme Court. She was really committed to helping our next generation understand the importance of our civics.

I had the opportunity to meet Justice Ginsburg with my daughter when my daughter was about 10. My daughter was very anxious to ask a question of her. She asked her: "When will we

have a female President?" Justice Ginsburg turned to her and said: "Probably not in my lifetime, but certainly in yours."

My daughter graduated from law school this year. We look forward to the fulfillment of Justice Ginsburg's prophecy.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this bill and support these statues. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, Women's History Month offers an opportunity to reflect on the courageous, patriotic women who have helped write our Nation's story.

Indeed, in every chapter of our history, women have been at the forefront: fighting for our rights, forging progress in every aspect of society, and pushing our nation to live up to our most cherished ideals.

So, it is in that powerful, pioneering spirit that I rise today in support of legislation that will honor two of these historic Americans: Justice Sandra Day O'Connor and Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg.

From their seats on the highest Court in the land, they were not only instrumental to upholding and defending our Constitution—but they paved a path in the field of law for generations of women to follow.

With this bill, we honor their extraordinary service by welcoming to the United States Capitol statues of these two trailblazing women.

Thank you to Congresswoman LOIS FRANKEL for your tireless, persistent leadership in establishing this special tribute—and for all that you do for America's women and girls.

Thanks also to Chair ZOE LOFGREN: who, at the helm of the Committee on House Administration, has been a steadfast champion in bringing more diversity and inclusion to monuments that fill the halls of the Congress.

These statues will not only ensure that Justices O'Connor and Ginsburg take their rightful place here, among the many heroes of our history.

But they will also ensure that all those who walk these hallowed halls—from Members and foreign leaders to young girls on school trips—can learn about and be inspired by the legacies of these two legendary leaders.

It is with great pride that, with this bill, we will soon welcome to the halls of Congress a statue of a living legend: Justice Sandra Day O'Connor.

Justice O'Connor has earned her deeply deserved place in history, as the first woman ever to sit on the Supreme Court.

But beyond the barrier-breaking nature of her service, she brought to the bench a pillar of courage, integrity and justice: our nation's highest ideals.

On the Court, she was always an independent and influential voice—bringing great wisdom, judgment and consideration to her opinions.

She also inspired the world as a proud working mother, proving that a woman can both excel in her career and care for her family.

She raised her three young sons while serving in the Arizona State Senate—where she was the first woman Majority Leader of a State Senate anywhere in the country.

And all were in awe of her strength in serving as her late husband's caregiver during his battle with Alzheimer's.

Justice O'Connor once said: "It's good to be first—but you don't want to be last." Indeed, she always held open the door behind her: mentoring so many young women in law, including our beloved Ruth Bader Ginsburg.

And our Nation is so proud that Justice Ginsburg will join that of Justice O'Connor here on Capitol Hill.

Ruth Bader Ginsburg truly embodied justice, brilliance and goodness—and nearly every family in America benefited from her quarter century on the Court fighting for equality, opportunity and justice for all.

The "Notorious RBG" quickly became an icon on the bench:

an outstanding and independent legal mind; a tenacious defender of our fundamental rights; and

the author of fiery opinions still referenced to this day.

And throughout her entire career, she was a tireless advocate for gender equality, whether: working at the ACLU as the founder of its Women's Rights Project;

arguing cases before the Supreme Court; or handing down legal opinions cementing the precedent that all men and women are created equal.

After her devastating loss two years ago, it was my solemn privilege as Speaker to welcome her one final time back to the Capitol to lie in state.

Now, it is with great respect and admiration for her legacy of powerful progress for women that the Congress passes this legislation to ensure her statue will be a permanent fixture of our Temple of Democracy.

It is fitting that we enact this legislation amid the historic confirmation process of Judge Ketanji Brown Jackson.

She was magnificent during the Committee proceedings last week—demonstrating her brilliant legal mind, her remarkable confidence and poise, and her unyielding commitment to justice.

And this is a moment of great pride and patriotism for our nation, as she will soon make history as the first Black woman on the Supreme Court.

Indeed, Judge Jackson is a blazing new trail for the next generation of public servants—in the same pioneering spirit as the two extraordinary leaders we are honoring with this legislation today.

God blessed America with the leadership of Sandra Day O'Connor and Ruth Bader Ginsburg—and many of us today stand on their shoulders.

With this bill, we ensure that all visit the Capitol feel their eternal presence and that our children will learn about their towering legacies.

I urge a strong, bipartisan "aye" vote.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 3294, a bill to place in the Capitol or on the Capitol Grounds a statue to honor Associate Justice of the Supreme Court Sandra Day O'Connor and a statue to honor Associate Justice of the Supreme Court Ruth Bader Ginsburg.

Justice Sandra Day O'Connor was the first woman nominated to the United States Supreme Court by President Ronald Reagan and was the 102nd appointee to the position.

Justice O'Connor served from September 25, 1981, until her retirement on January 31, 2006.

During her tenure on the court, Justice O'Connor was often the crucial swing vote in

5–4 decisions that included many of the most controversial issues of our time.

Justice O'Connor has had a long and distinguished career as a public servant, including three terms as an Arizona State Senator, and serving as a judge on the Superior Court of Maricopa County, and the Arizona Court of Appeals.

Associate Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg was the second woman appointed, and the first Jewish woman, to preside on United States Supreme Court.

Justice Ginsburg was appointed to the court by President Bill Clinton on August 10, 1993 and served on the court until her death on September 18, 2020.

Justice Ginsburg was an advocate for women's rights long before she was appointed to the court. She co-founded the Women's Rights Project at the ACLU.

In the words of the late Justice Ginsburg, "women's rights are an essential part of the overall human rights agenda, trained on the equal dignity and ability to live in freedom all people should enjoy."

These women broke down barriers that once stood in the way of equality. Their determination and persistence allowed for women across the nation to fight for their rights and achieve their dreams.

Their sacrifices paved the way for many firsts on the Federal bench. Justice Sonia Sotomayor was the first Hispanic woman to be appointed to the position, and just last month, Judge Ketanji Brown Jackson was the first African American woman to be nominated to the court.

Although these are monumental steps for women and gender equality, there is still much work that needs to be done.

It is our duty as Members of Congress to acknowledge and commemorate these inspiring Supreme Court Justices. The two statues in our nation's Capital will honor the lives and legacies of these two pioneering women. Moreover, by celebrating Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg and Justice Sandra Day O'Connor we celebrate the impact of women nationwide and showcase these two leaders as remodels for future generations. I urge all my colleagues to support S. 3294.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. SCANLON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 3294.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion are postponed.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess for a period of less than 15 minutes.

Accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 23 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1830

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MRVAN) at 6 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

PROHIBITING PUNISHMENT OF ACQUITTED CONDUCT ACT OF 2021

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MRVAN). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1621) to amend section 3661 of title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the consideration of acquitted conduct at sentencing, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 405, nays 12, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 83]

YEAS—405

Adams	Castro (TX)	Estes
Aderholt	Cawthorn	Evans
Aguilar	Chabot	Fallon
Allred	Cheney	Feenstra
Amodel	Cherfilus	Ferguson
Armstrong	McCormick	Fischbach
Auchincloss	Chu	Fitzgerald
Axne	Cicilline	Fitzpatrick
Babin	Clark (MA)	Fleischmann
Bacon	Clarke (NY)	Fletcher
Baird	Cleaver	Foster
Balderson	Cline	Fox
Banks	Cloud	Frankel, Lois
Barr	Clyburn	Franklin, C.
Barragán	Clyde	Scott
Bass	Cohen	Fulcher
Beatty	Cole	Gaetz
Bentz	Comer	Gallagher
Bera	Connolly	Gallego
Bergman	Cooper	Garamendi
Beyer	Correa	Garbarino
Bice (OK)	Costa	Garcia (CA)
Biggs	Courtney	Garcia (IL)
Bilirakis	Craig	Garcia (TX)
Bishop (GA)	Crawford	Gibbs
Bishop (NC)	Crenshaw	Gimenez
Blumenauer	Crist	Gohmert
Blunt Rochester	Crow	Golden
Boebert	Cuellar	Gomez
Bonamici	Curtis	Gonzales, Tony
Bost	Davidson	Gonzalez (OH)
Bourdeaux	Davis, Danny K.	Gonzalez, Sean
Bowman	Davis, Rodney	Good (VA)
Boyle, Brendan	Dean	Gooden (TX)
F.	DeGette	Gosar
Brady	DeLauro	Gottheimer
Brooks	DelBene	Granger
Brown (MD)	Delgado	Graves (LA)
Brown (OH)	Demings	Graves (MO)
Brownley	DeSaulnier	Green (TN)
Buchanan	Budd	Green, Al (TX)
Bucshon	Burchett	Greene (GA)
Budd	Bush	Griffith
Burgess	Calvert	Grijalva
Cárdenas	Cammack	Grothman
Carey	Carbajal	Guthrie
F.	Cardenas	Harris
Carl	Carey	Harshbarger
Carson	Carl	Hartzler
Carter (GA)	Carson	Hayes
Carter (LA)	Carter (GA)	Hern
Carter (TX)	Carter (LA)	Herrrell
Cartwright	Carter (TX)	Herrera Beutler
Case	Cartwright	Hice (GA)
	Case	Higgins (NY)
	Espallat	

Hill	McCollum	Schakowsky
Himes	McEachin	Schiff
Hinson	McGovern	Schneider
Horsford	McHenry	Schrader
Houlihan	McKinley	Schrier
Hoyer	McNerney	Schweikert
Hudson	Meeks	Scott (VA)
Huffman	Meijer	Scott, Austin
Issa	Meng	Scott, David
Jackson Lee	Meuser	Sessions
Jacobs (CA)	Mfume	Sewell
Jacobs (NY)	Miller (IL)	Sherman
Jayapal	Miller (WV)	Sherrill
Jeffries	Miller-Meeks	Simpson
Johnson (GA)	Moolenaar	Sires
Johnson (LA)	Mooney	Slotkin
Johnson (OH)	Moore (AL)	Smith (MO)
Johnson (SD)	Moore (UT)	Smith (NE)
Johnson (TX)	Moore (WI)	Smith (NJ)
Jones	Morelle	Smith (WA)
Jordan	Moulton	Smucker
Joyce (OH)	Mrvan	Soto
Joyce (PA)	Mullin	Spanberger
Kahele	Murphy (FL)	Spartz
Kaptur	Murphy (NC)	Speier
Katko	Nadler	Stansbury
Keating	Napolitano	Stanton
Keller	Neal	Staubert
Kelly (IL)	Neguse	Steel
Kelly (PA)	Nehls	Stefanik
Khanna	Newhouse	Steil
Kildee	Newman	Steube
Kilmer	Norcross	Stevens
Kim (CA)	Norman	Stewart
Kim (NJ)	O'Halleran	Strickland
Kind	Obernole	Suozzi
Kirkpatrick	Ocasio-Cortez	Swalwell
Krishnamoorthi	Omar	Takano
Kuster	Owens	Taylor
LaHood	Palazzo	Thompson (CA)
LaMalfa	Pallone	Thompson (MS)
Lamb	Palmer	Thompson (PA)
Lamborn	Panetta	Tiffany
Langevin	Pappas	Timmons
Larsen (WA)	Pascrell	Titus
Larson (CT)	Payne	Tlaib
Latta	Pence	Tonko
LaTurner	Perlmutter	Torres (NY)
Lawrence	Perry	Trahan
Lawson (FL)	Peters	Trone
Lee (CA)	Pfluger	Turner
Lee (NV)	Phillips	Underwood
Leger Fernandez	Pingree	Upton
Lesko	Pocan	Valadao
Letlow	Porter	Van Drew
Levin (CA)	Posey	Van Dyne
Levin (MI)	Pressley	Vargas
Lieu	Price (NC)	Veasey
Lofgren	Quigley	Velazquez
Long	Raskin	Wagner
Lowenthal	Reed	Walberg
Lucas	Reschenthaler	Walorski
Luetkemeyer	Rice (NY)	Waltz
Luria	Rice (SC)	Wasserman
Lynch	Rodgers (WA)	Schultz
Mace	Rogers (AL)	Waters
Malinowski	Rogers (KY)	Watson Coleman
Malliotakis	Rose	Webster (FL)
Maloney	Rosendale	Welch
Carolyn B.	Ross	Wenstrup
Maloney, Sean	Rouzer	Westerman
Mann	Roybal-Allard	Wexton
Manning	Ruiz	Wild
Massie	Ruppersberger	Williams (GA)
Mast	Rush	Williams (TX)
Matsui	Ryan	Wilson (FL)
McBath	Salazar	Wilson (SC)
McCarthy	Sánchez	Wittman
McCaul	Sarbanes	Womack
McClain	Scalise	
McClintock	Scanlon	

NAYS—12

Allen	Higgins (LA)	Roy
Arrington	Huizenga	Rutherford
Buck	Kelly (MS)	Tenney
Burgess	Kustoff	Weber (TX)

NOT VOTING—14

Bustos	Guest	Torres (CA)
Butterfield	Hollingsworth	Vela
Casten	Jackson	Yarmuth
DeFazio	Kinzing	Zeldin
Fortenberry	Loudermilk	

□ 1905

Mr. STAUBER and Mrs. FISCHBACH changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. CASTEN. Mr. Speaker, I missed rollcall vote No. 83. Had I been present, I would have voted as follows: “yea” on rollcall No. 83.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Barragán (Gomez)	Green (TN) (Armstrong)	Roybal-Allard (Wasserman Schultz)
Bass (Takano)	Harder (CA) (Gomez)	Ryan (Kildee)
Bilirakis (Fleischmann)	Johnson (TX) (Jeffries)	Salazar (Dunn)
Bowman (Evans)	Joyce (OH) (Garbarino)	Sánchez (Correa)
Boyle, Brendan	Kahele (Mrvan)	Sires (Pallone)
F. (Evans)	Khanna (Beyer)	Spartz (Walorski)
Buchanan (Waltz)	Kind (Beyer)	Suozi (Beyer)
Cawthorn (Fallon)	Lamb (Scanlon)	Taylor (Carter)
Crist	Lawson (FL) (Evans)	Tiffany (Fitzgerald)
(Wasserman Schultz)	Mace (Rice (SC))	(Tonko (Pallone))
DeGette (Blunt)	McEachin (Wexton)	Valadao (Garbarino)
Rochester)	Meng (Kuster)	Waters (Takano)
Deutch (Rice (NY))	Moulton (Beyer)	Wild (Axne)
Gosar (Gaetz)	Omar (Blunt)	Williams (GA) (Jeffries)
Gottheimer (Pallone)	Rochester)	Wilson (FL) (Cicilline)
Payne (Pallone)		

REMEMBERING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF THE HONORABLE DONALD E. YOUNG

(Mr. MCCARTHY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MCCARTHY. Madam Speaker, tonight, Congress opens back up for the first time in 49 years without Congressman Don Young, and this Chamber is going to feel a big hole, especially, off to my left in the back side in that chair. No one in here has assigned seating, except our dean did.

For the first time in 49 years, we will not hear Don's booming voice yelling “regular order.”

For the first time in 49 years, we won't see that big smile or friendly laugh.

For the first time in 49 years, we won't hear that strong voice when it comes to an issue about Alaska. But we will never forget him or the legacy he leaves behind.

Don taught all of us, and especially me, three big lessons.

First, he taught us how to fight for what you believe in, regardless of party.

Second, he taught us how deep a love can be for your own family, and savor every moment together.

Third, he reminded us of what an honor it is to serve our constituents.

We will miss Don deeply. But more importantly, we will not forget him.

Madam Speaker, I ask that the House rise to observe a moment of silence for our dean, Congressman Don Young.

MOMENT OF SILENCE IN REMEMBRANCE OF THE HONORABLE DONALD E. YOUNG

The SPEAKER. The Chair asks all those present in the Chamber, as well as Members and staff throughout the Capitol, to please rise for a moment of silence in remembrance of the late Honorable Donald E. Young of Alaska.

STATUE TO HONOR UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT ASSOCIATE JUSTICE SANDRA DAY O'CONNOR AND STATUE TO HONOR UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT ASSOCIATE JUSTICE RUTH BADER GINSBURG

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 3294) to obtain and direct the placement in the Capitol or on the Capitol Grounds of a statue to honor Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States Sandra Day O'Connor and a statue to honor Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States Ruth Bader Ginsburg, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. HAYES). The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. SCANLON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 349, nays 63, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 84]

YEAS—349

Adams	Carter (LA)	Doggett
Aderholt	Carter (TX)	Doyle, Michael
Aguilar	Cartwright	F.
Allred	Case	Dunn
Amodei	Casten	Ellzey
Armstrong	Castor (FL)	Emmer
Auchincloss	Castro (TX)	Escobar
Axne	Cawthorn	Eshoo
Bacon	Chabot	Espallat
Baird	Cheney	Evans
Balderson	Cherfilus-	Feenstra
Banks	McCormick	Fitzgerald
Barr	Chu	Fitzpatrick
Barragán	Ciulline	Fleischmann
Bass	Clark (MA)	Fletcher
Beatty	Clarke (NY)	Poster
Bentz	Cleaver	Foxx
Bera	Clyburn	Frankel, Lois
Bergman	Cohen	Fulcher
Beyer	Cole	Gallagher
Bice (OK)	Comer	Gallego
Bilirakis	Connolly	Garamendi
Bishop (GA)	Correa	Garbarino
Blumenauer	Costa	Garcia (CA)
Blunt Rochester	Courtney	Garcia (IL)
Bonamici	Craig	Garcia (TX)
Bost	Crawford	Gibbs
Bourdeaux	Crist	Gimenez
Bowman	Crow	Golden
Boyle, Brendan	Cuellar	Gomez
F.	Curtis	Gonzales, Tony
Brown (MD)	Davids (KS)	Gonzalez (OH)
Brown (OH)	Davis, Danny K.	Gonzalez,
Brownley	Davis, Rodney	Vicente
Buchanan	Dean	Gottheimer
Bucshon	DeGette	Granger
Bush	DeLauro	Graves (LA)
Calvert	DelBene	Graves (MO)
Carbajal	Delgado	Green (TN)
Cárdenas	Demings	Green, Al (TX)
Carey	DeSaulnier	Grijalva
Carl	Deuth	Guthrie
Carson	Diaz-Balart	Harder (CA)
Carter (GA)	Dingell	Hayes

Herrera Beutler	McBath	Schneider
Higgins (NY)	McCarthy	Schrader
Hill	McCauley	Schrier
Himes	McClain	Schweikert
Hinson	McCollum	Scott (VA)
Horsford	McEachin	Scott, Austin
Houlihan	McGovern	Scott, David
Hoyer	McHenry	Sessions
Hudson	McKinley	Sewell
Huffman	McNerney	Sherman
Huizenga	Meeks	Sherrill
Issa	Meijer	Simpson
Jackson Lee	Meng	Sires
Jacobs (CA)	Meuser	Slotkin
Jacobs (NY)	Mfume	Smith (MO)
Jayapal	Miller (WV)	Smith (NE)
Jeffries	Miller-Meeks	Smith (WA)
Johnson (GA)	Moore (AL)	Smucker
Johnson (OH)	Moore (UT)	Soto
Johnson (SD)	Moore (WI)	Spanberger
Johnson (TX)	Morelle	Spartz
Jones	Moulton	Stansbury
Jordan	Mrvan	Stanton
Joyce (OH)	Murphy (FL)	Staubert
Kahele	Murphy (NC)	Steel
Kaptur	Nadler	Stefanik
Katko	Napolitano	Steil
Keating	Neal	Stevens
Keller	Neguse	Stewart
Kelly (IL)	Nehls	Strickland
Kelly (MS)	Newhouse	Suozzi
Kelly (PA)	Newman	Swalwell
Khanna	Norcross	Takano
Kildee	O'Halleran	Taylor
Kilmer	Obernolte	Tenney
Kim (CA)	Ocasio-Cortez	Thompson (CA)
Kim (NJ)	Omar	Thompson (MS)
Kind	Palazzo	Thompson (PA)
Kirkpatrick	Pallone	Tiffany
Krishnamoorthi	Palmer	Timmons
Kuster	Panetta	Titus
Kustoff	Pappas	Tlaib
LaHood	Pascrell	Tonko
Lamb	Payne	Torres (NY)
Lamborn	Pence	Trahan
Langevin	Perlmutter	Trone
Larsen (WA)	Peters	Turner
Larson (CT)	Phillips	Underwood
Latta	Pingree	Upton
LaTurner	Pocan	Valadao
Lawrence	Porter	Van Drew
Lawson (FL)	Pressley	Vargas
Lee (CA)	Price (NC)	Veasey
Lee (NV)	Quigley	Velázquez
Leger Fernandez	Raskin	Wagner
Lesko	Reed	Walorski
Letlow	Reschenthaler	Waltz
Levin (CA)	Rice (NY)	Wasserman
Levin (MI)	Rodgers (WA)	Schultz
Lieu	Rogers (AL)	Waters
Lofgren	Rogers (KY)	Watson Coleman
Long	Ross	Webster (FL)
Lowenthal	Rouzer	Welch
Lucas	Roybal-Allard	Wenstrup
Luetkemeyer	Ruiz	Westerman
Luria	Ruppersberger	Wexton
Lynch	Rush	Wild
Mace	Ryan	Williams (GA)
Malinowski	Salazar	Williams (TX)
Malliotakis	Sánchez	Wilson (FL)
Maloney,	Sarbanes	Wilson (SC)
Carolyn B.	Scalise	Wittman
Maloney, Sean	Scanlon	Womack
Manning	Schakowsky	
Matsui	Schiff	

NAYS—63

Allen	Ferguson	Mann
Arrington	Fischbach	Massie
Babin	Franklin, C.	Mast
Biggs	Scott	McClintock
Bishop (NC)	Gaetz	Miller (IL)
Boebert	Gohmert	Moolenaar
Brooks	Good (VA)	Mooney
Buck	Gooden (TX)	Mullin
Budd	Gosar	Norman
Burchett	Greene (GA)	Owens
Burgess	Griffith	Perry
Cammack	Grothman	Pfluger
Cline	Harris	Posey
Cloud	Harshbarger	Rose
Clyde	Hartzler	Rosendale
Crenshaw	Hern	Roy
Davidson	Herrell	Steube
DesJarlais	Hice (GA)	Van Duyne
Donalds	Higgins (LA)	Walberg
Duncan	Johnson (LA)	Weber (TX)
Estes	Joyce (PA)	
Fallon	LaMalfa	

NOT VOTING—19

Brady	Hollingsworth	Speier
Bustos	Jackson	Torres (CA)
Butterfield	Kinzinger	Vela
Cooper	Loudermilk	Yarmuth
DeFazio	Rice (SC)	Zeldin
Fortenberry	Rutherford	
Guest	Smith (NJ)	

□ 1929

Messrs. BURGESS and PFLUGER changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Barragán	Green (TN)	Roybal-Allard
(Gomez)	(Armstrong)	(Wasserman)
Bass (Takano)	Harder (CA)	Schultz)
Bilirakis	(Gomez)	Ryan (Kildee)
(Fleischmann)	Johnson (TX)	Salazar (Dunn)
Bowman (Evans)	(Jeffries)	Sánchez (Correa)
Boyle, Brendan	Joyce (OH)	Sires (Pallone)
F. (Evans)	(Garbarino)	Spartz
Buchanan	Kahele (Mrvan)	(Walorski)
(Waltz)	Khanna (Beyer)	Suozzi (Beyer)
Cawthorn	Kind (Beyer)	Taylor (Carter
(Fallon)	Lamb (Scanlon)	(TX))
Crist	Lawson (FL)	Tiffany
(Wasserman	(Evans)	(Fitzgerald)
Schultz)	Mace (Rice (SC))	Tonko (Pallone)
DeGette (Blunt	McEachin	Valadao
Rochester)	(Wexton)	(Garbarino)
Deutch (Rice	Meng (Kuster)	Waters (Takano)
(NY))	Moulton (Beyer)	Wild (Axne)
Gosar (Gaetz)	Omar (Blunt	Wilson (FL)
Gottheimer	Rochester)	(Cicilline)
(Pallone)	Payne (Pallone)	

EXPRESSING THE PROFOUND SORROW OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES ON THE DEATH OF THE HONORABLE DONALD E. YOUNG

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1004

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of the Honorable Donald E. Young, a Representative from the State of Alaska and beloved Dean of the House.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That when the House adjourns today, it adjourn as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 11(b) of House Resolution 188, and pursuant to House Resolution 1004, the House stands adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 29, 2022, at 3 p.m. as a further mark of respect to the memory of the late Honorable Donald E. Young. Thereupon (at 7 o'clock and 33 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned

until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 29, 2022, at 3 p.m. as a further mark of respect to the memory of the late Honorable Donald E. Young.

BUDGETARY EFFECTS OF PAYGO LEGISLATION

Pursuant to the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 (PAYGO), Mr. YARMUTH hereby submits, prior to the vote on passage, the attached estimate of the costs of H.R. 1621, the Prohibiting Punishment of Acquitted Conduct Act of 2021, as amended, for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

ESTIMATE OF PAY-AS-YOU-GO EFFECTS FOR H.R. 1621

	By fiscal year, in millions of dollars—											
	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	2031	2022–2026	2022–2031
Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Impact	0	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	8	18
Components may not sum to totals because of rounding.												

Pursuant to the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 (PAYGO), Mr. YARMUTH hereby submits, prior to the vote on passage, for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, that H.R. 4738, the COVID-19 American History Project Act, as amended, would have no significant effect on the deficit, and therefore, the budgetary effects of such bill are estimated as zero.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

EC-3686. A letter from the Chief Innovation Officer, Rural Development Innovation Center, Rural Housing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Multi-Family Housing (MFH) Direct Loan Programs [Docket No: RHS-21-MFH-0026] (RIN: 0575-AD17) received March 15, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

EC-3687. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting an update of the Commission's rules — Updating Broadcast Radio Technical Rules [MB Docket No.: 21-263] received March 16, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-3688. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Wireline Competition Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Improving Competitive Broadband Access to Multiple Tenant Environments [GN Docket No.: 17-142] received March 15, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-3689. A letter from the Senior Bureau Official, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a memorandum of justification for drawdowns under sections 506(a)(1) and 552(c)(2) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC-3690. A letter from the Senior Bureau Official, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a memorandum of justification of drawdowns under section 506(a)(1) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC-3691. A letter from the Senior Bureau Official, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a determination under section 506(a)(1) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC-3692. A letter from the Senior Bureau Official, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a determination under section 506(a)(1) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC-3693. A letter from the Director, Legal Processing Division, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — User Fees Relating to the Enrolled Agent Special Enrollment Examination and the Enrolled Retirement Plan Agent Special Enrollment Examination [TD 9962] (RIN: 1545-BQ06) received March 15, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. NADLER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1621. A bill to amend section 3661 of title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the consideration of acquitted conduct at sentencing (Rept. 117-279). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. NADLER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3359. A bill to provide for a system for reviewing the case files of cold case murders at the instance of certain persons, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 117-280). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. LYNCH (for himself, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Ms. PRESSLEY, Ms. ADAMS, and Ms. TLAIB):

H.R. 7231. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Treasury to develop and pilot digital dollar technologies that replicate the privacy-respecting features of physical cash; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. CÁRDENAS (for himself, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. MOULTON, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. BEYER, and Mr. RASKIN):

H.R. 7232. A bill to provide for improvements in the implementation of the National Suicide Prevention Lifeline, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HUDSON (for himself and Ms. KUSTER):

H.R. 7233. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide for requirements under Medicaid State plans for health screenings and referrals for certain eligible juveniles in public institutions; and to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to issue clear and specific guidance under the Medicaid and Children's Health Insurance programs to improve the delivery of health care services, including mental health services, in elementary and secondary schools and school-based health centers; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. SPANBERGER (for herself, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Ms. SALAZAR, and Mr. ARMSTRONG):

H.R. 7234. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize certain programs with respect to mental health conditions and substance use disorders, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. TONKO (for himself, Mr. GUTHRIE, Ms. WILD, and Mr. MCKINLEY):

H.R. 7235. A bill to amend title XIX of the Public Health Service Act to make certain improvements with respect to block grants for substance use prevention, treatment, and recovery services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. ESHOO (for herself, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER):

H.R. 7236. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to expand the availability of mental, emotional, and behavioral health services under the Medicaid program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GRIFFITH (for himself, Ms. TENNEY, Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas, and Ms. CRAIG):

H.R. 7237. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize certain mental health, suicide prevention, and crisis care programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BUCSHON (for himself, Mrs. AXNE, Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS, and Mr. PAPPAS):

H.R. 7238. A bill to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall revise opioid treatment program admission criteria to eliminate the requirement that patients have been addicted for at least 1 year prior to being admitted for treatment; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary,

for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SMUCKER:

H.R. 7239. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for an H-2C nonimmigrant classification, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Oversight and Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. BASS (for herself, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. PHILLIPS, Ms. PORTER, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mrs. CHERFILUS-McCORMICK, Ms. SALAZAR, and Ms. GRANGER):

H.R. 7240. A bill to reauthorize the READ Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CRENSHAW (for himself, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. GARCIA of California, and Mrs. LURIA):

H.R. 7241. A bill to amend title XIX of the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize the community mental health services block grant program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas (for herself and Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana):

H.R. 7242. A bill to require the President to develop and maintain products that show the risk of natural hazards across the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois (for himself and Ms. UNDERWOOD):

H.R. 7243. A bill to restore entitlement to educational assistance under Veterans Rapid Retraining Program in cases of a closure of an educational institution or a disapproval of a program of education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FITZGERALD (for himself, Mr. BUCK, Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. GROTHMAN, Ms. HERRELL, Mr. BUDD, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. CAREY, Mr. STEIL, Mr. TIFFANY, and Mr. ELLZEY):

H.R. 7244. A bill to require the Director of the Bureau of Justice Statistics to submit to Congress a report relating to individuals granted bail and pretrial release in State courts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. GARCIA of Texas (for herself, Ms. PORTER, Ms. DEAN, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. CARTER of Louisiana, and Mr. GREEN of Texas):

H.R. 7245. A bill to establish a whistleblower program at the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GOTTHEIMER (for himself, Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas, Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio, and Mr. BACON):

H.R. 7246. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize the Assistant Secretary for Mental Health and Substance Use to award grants, contracts, and cooperative agreements for planning, establishing, or administering programs to prevent and address the misuse of opioids, related drugs, and other drugs commonly used in pain management or injury recovery, as well as the co-use of one or more such drugs with other substances, by students and stu-

dent athletes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HORSFORD:

H.R. 7247. A bill to amend the Apex Project, Nevada Land Transfer and Authorization Act of 1989 to include the City of North Las Vegas and the Apex Industrial Park Owners Association, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. GIMENEZ, and Ms. UNDERWOOD):

H.R. 7248. A bill to amend title V of the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize certain mental health programs for children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. MATSUI (for herself, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. DEUTCH, and Mr. VAN DREW):

H.R. 7249. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide education and training on eating disorders for health care providers and communities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MCKINLEY (for himself and Ms. SHERRILL):

H.R. 7250. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to provide that grants under the COPS program may be used for salary increases to retain officers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCNERNEY:

H.R. 7251. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to provide grants to eligible local educational agencies to encourage female students to pursue studies and careers in science, mathematics, engineering, and technology; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. NORTON (for herself, Ms. BASS, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, and Ms. LEE of California):

H.R. 7252. A bill to require a report on expenditures for contracts for advertising services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself, Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania, and Ms. SCHRIER):

H.R. 7253. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to provide for clarification of requirements for the remanufacturing of medical devices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. PORTER (for herself and Mrs. DINGELL):

H.R. 7254. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Health and Human Services to award grants to States and political subdivisions of States to hire, employ, train, and dispatch mental health professionals to respond in lieu of law enforcement officers in emergencies involving one or more persons with a mental illness or an intellectual or developmental disability, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. RODGERS of Washington (for herself, Mrs. TRAHAN, Mrs. AXNE, and Mrs. KIM of California):

H.R. 7255. A bill to amend title V of the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize the Garrett Lee Smith Memorial Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ROSENDALE:

H.R. 7256. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to modify the information

technology systems of the Department of Veterans Affairs to provide for the automatic processing of claims for certain temporary disability ratings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RUIZ:

H.R. 7257. A bill to require U.S. Customs and Border Protection to perform an initial health screening on detainees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Homeland Security, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SESSIONS:

H.R. 7258. A bill to eliminate the individual and employer health coverage mandates under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, to expand beyond that Act the choices in obtaining and financing affordable health insurance coverage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Education and Labor, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SESSIONS:

H.R. 7259. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to direct the Attorney General to register practitioners to transport controlled substances to States in which the practitioner is not registered under the Act for the purpose of administering the substances (under applicable State law) at locations other than principal places of business or professional practice; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MCCARTHY:

H. Res. 1004. A resolution expressing the profound sorrow of the House of Representatives on the death of the Honorable Donald E. Young; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana (for himself, Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana, Mr. DUNN, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. HERN, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. TONY GONZALES of Texas, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mr. DAVIDSON, Mr. TURNER, Mrs. HINSON, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Miss GONZALEZ-COLON, Mr. GARBARINO, Mr. TIMMONS, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. DUNCAN, Ms. HERRELL, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. BANKS, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. MAST, Mr. ISSA, Mr. ELLZEY, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Ms. SALAZAR, Mr. CARL, Ms. LETLOW, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mrs. MILLER of West Virginia, Ms. MALLIOTAKIS, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. VAN DREW, Mr. MOORE of Alabama, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. EMMER, Mr. CAREY, Mr. FEENSTRA, Mr. OWENS, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. CAWTHORN, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. LAMALFA, Mrs. FISCHBACH, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. ARMSTRONG, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mr. BARR, Mr. LUTKEMEYER, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. FULCHER, Mr. C. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida, Mr. KELLER, Mr. NEHLS, Mr. GOODEN of Texas, Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS, Mr. OBERNOLTE, Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania, Mr.

BALDERSON, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. RESCHENTHALER, Mr. GIMENEZ, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. BRADY, Mr. HUIZENGA, Mr. ROSENDALE, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. DONALDS, Mrs. LESKO, Mr. AMODEI, Ms. CHENEY, Mr. STAUBER, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mrs. STEEL, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. PFLUGER, Mr. GUEST, Ms. VAN DUYN, Mr. MELJER, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. LATTI, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. MOONEY, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. FITZGERALD, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mrs. KIM of California, Mr. LONG, Mr. PALMER, Mr. PERRY, Mr. STEUBE, Mr. HILL, Mr. KUSTOFF, Mrs. HARSHBARGER, Mrs. BICE of Oklahoma, Mrs. SPARTZ, Mr. WALTZ, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. JORDAN, and Mr. BENTZ):

H. Res. 1005. A resolution honoring the life and legacy of the late Congressman Don Young of Alaska; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. LAHOOD:

H. Res. 1006. A resolution expressing support for the designation of the week of March 27, 2022, through April 2, 2022, as "National Cleaning Week"; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. SCANLON (for herself, Ms. BASS, Mr. TONKO, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. MEUSER, Mr. SWALWELL, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. KIM of New Jersey, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. NEAL, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, and Mr. VALADAO):

H. Res. 1007. A resolution supporting the designation of Vaisakhi, April 14 of each year, as "National Sikh Day"; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. THOMPSON of California (for himself, Ms. ADAMS, Ms. BARRAGAN, Ms. BASS, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BEYER, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. CARTER of Louisiana, Mr. CASTEN, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. COHEN, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. CORREA, Mr. COSTA, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. DELBENE, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. ESCOBAR, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Ms. HOULAHAN, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. KAHELE, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. NADLER, Ms. NEWMAN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. PANETTA, Ms. SANCHEZ, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. SEWELL, Mrs. CHERFILUS-MCCORMICK, Mr. SWALWELL, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. TITUS, Mr. TONKO, Mrs. TRAHAN, Mr. TRONE, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. BROWNLEY, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. YARMUTH, Mrs. LEE of Nevada, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. MENG, Mr. RUSH, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. NEGUSE, Ms. STEVENS, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. SAN NICOLAS, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. CHU, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Mr. SOTO, and Ms. SLOTKIN):

H. Res. 1008. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Women's History Month; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. LYNCH:

H.R. 7231.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. CÁRDENAS:

H.R. 7232.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 1.

All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

By Mr. HUDSON:

H.R. 7233.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution.

By Ms. SPANBERGER:

H.R. 7234.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. TONKO:

H.R. 7235.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Ms. ESHOO:

H.R. 7236.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. GRIFFITH:

H.R. 7237.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BUCHON:

H.R. 7238.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

article 1, section 8, clause 3

By Mr. SMUCKER:

H.R. 7239.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of section 8 of article 1 of the Constitution

By Ms. BASS:

H.R. 7240.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 1 of the United States Constitution, providing—"All legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives."

By Mr. CRENSHAW:

H.R. 7241.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section VIII, Clause III

By Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas:

H.R. 7242.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1: "The Congress shall have Power to . . . provide for the . . . general welfare of the United States; . . ."

By Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 7243.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution: To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the powers enumerated under section 8 and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. FITZGERALD:

H.R. 7244.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Ms. GARCIA of Texas:

H.R. 7245.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. GOTTHEIMER:

H.R. 7246.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. HORSFORD:

H.R. 7247.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 7248.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Ms. MATSUI:

H.R. 7249.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. MCKINLEY:

H.R. 7250.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof

By Mr. MCNERNEY:

H.R. 7251.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States grants Congress the authority to enact this bill.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 7252.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. PETERS:

H.R. 7253.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Ms. PORTER:

H.R. 7254.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mrs. RODGERS of Washington:

H.R. 7255.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1, Section 8 of Article 1 of the United States Constitution which reads:

“The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts, and Excises, to pay the Debts, and provide for the common Defense and General Welfare of the United States; but all Duties and Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.”

By Mr. ROSENDALE:

H.R. 7256.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. RUIZ:

H.R. 7257.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, Clauses 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution, to provide for the general welfare and make all laws necessary and proper to carry out the powers of Congress.

By Mr. SESSIONS:

H.R. 7258.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 of the Constitution

By Mr. SESSIONS:

H.R. 7259.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 of the Constitution

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 19: Ms. GRANGER.

H.R. 38: Mr. GARBARINO.

H.R. 74: Mr. DONALDS.

H.R. 95: Mr. FULCHER, Mr. HILL, and Mr. BUCSHON.

H.R. 262: Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 310: Mrs. CHERFILUS-McCORMICK, Ms. NEWMAN, and Mr. BENTZ.

H.R. 426: Mr. RICE of South Carolina and Mrs. BOEBERT.

H.R. 431: Mr. LIEU.

H.R. 432: Mr. MORELLE and Mr. AGUILAR.

H.R. 477: Mr. STANTON.

H.R. 794: Mr. BEYER.

H.R. 858: Mr. VICENTE GONZALEZ of Texas.

H.R. 955: Mr. COOPER.

H.R. 962: Mr. GOLDEN and Mr. SAN NICOLAS.

H.R. 1177: Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 1229: Mr. GIMENEZ.

H.R. 1282: Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio and Mr. KHANNA.

H.R. 1297: Mrs. CHERFILUS-McCORMICK.

H.R. 1334: Ms. BOURDEAUX, Mrs. MCBATH, Ms. STRICKLAND, Mr. HARDER of California, Ms. CRAIG, Ms. NEWMAN, and Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 1384: Mr. BERA, Mrs. KIM of California, Ms. KAPTUR, and Ms. TITUS.

H.R. 1481: Mr. TAKANO.

H.R. 1517: Ms. MATSUI.

H.R. 1607: Mr. HIMES and Ms. CRAIG.

H.R. 1621: Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia.

H.R. 1627: Mr. GALLEGO and Mr. LANGEVIN.

H.R. 1696: Mr. PHILLIPS and Ms. TLAIB.

H.R. 1803: Mr. CICILLINE, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. PORTER, and Ms. CHU.

H.R. 1842: Mr. COHEN, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. GOMEZ, Ms. MATSUI, and Mr. CHABOT.

H.R. 1884: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, and Mr. SUOZZI.

H.R. 1919: Mr. RYAN.

H.R. 1946: Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. EVANS, Mr. LATURNER, Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio, and Mr. DOGETT.

H.R. 1956: Mrs. TRAHAN and Mr. ROGERS of Alabama.

H.R. 2021: Ms. BROWN of Ohio.

H.R. 2038: Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, and Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 2168: Mr. VEASEY.

H.R. 2193: Ms. STANSBURY, Mr. RUSH, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Ms. TLAIB, and Mr. CASTEN.

H.R. 2244: Mrs. DINGELL.

H.R. 2256: Mr. POSEY and Mrs. CHERFILUS-McCORMICK.

H.R. 2294: Mr. TONKO and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

H.R. 2351: Mr. KIM of New Jersey, Mr. CASTEN, Mr. REED, and Mr. MALINOWSKI.

H.R. 2363: Mr. NEGUSE.

H.R. 2400: Mr. NEGUSE.

H.R. 2499: Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, and Mr. WITTMAN.

H.R. 2519: Mr. MCGOVERN and Ms. NEWMAN.

H.R. 2525: Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia.

H.R. 2549: Mr. NEGUSE and Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 2586: Mr. BEYER, Ms. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. NEAL, Ms. SEWELL, Mr. CARTER of Louisiana, Mr. BERA, and Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 2611: Mr. STANTON.

H.R. 2644: Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 2654: Mr. ZELDIN and Mr. LATURNER.

H.R. 2703: Mr. SOTO.

H.R. 2724: Ms. TITUS.

H.R. 2750: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.

H.R. 2840: Ms. BOURDEAUX.

H.R. 2903: Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. LAMALFA, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. ROGERS of Alabama.

H.R. 2924: Mr. COHEN and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 2954: Ms. CRAIG, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. HILL, and Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia.

H.R. 2974: Mr. MORELLE, Mr. COOPER, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, and Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.R. 3100: Ms. ADAMS.

H.R. 3114: Ms. SHERRILL.

H.R. 3135: Mr. SHERMAN.

H.R. 3172: Ms. DEGETTE and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 3207: Ms. MACE.

H.R. 3244: Mr. CRIST.

H.R. 3281: Ms. TENNEY.

H.R. 3287: Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ.

H.R. 3294: Ms. ESHOO and Miss RICE of New York.

H.R. 3297: Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER.

H.R. 3321: Mr. MULLIN.

H.R. 3339: Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 3348: Mr. VARGAS, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. CARBAJAL, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 3359: Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia.

H.R. 3407: Mr. VEASEY.

H.R. 3455: Mr. POSEY.

H.R. 3482: Mr. DELGADO.

H.R. 3488: Ms. UNDERWOOD, Mrs. LURIA, and Mr. SABLON.

H.R. 3522: Mr. LAWSON of Florida.

H.R. 3525: Mr. GREEN of Texas and Ms. OMAR.

H.R. 3536: Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 3549: Mr. TONKO.

H.R. 3550: Mrs. HAYES.

H.R. 3577: Ms. PRESSLEY.

H.R. 3586: Mr. PAPPAS.

H.R. 3648: Ms. KUSTER.

H.R. 3728: Mr. KIM of New Jersey and Ms. KUSTER.

H.R. 3733: Mr. LONG and Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota.

H.R. 3748: Mr. LARSEN of Washington and Ms. KUSTER.

H.R. 3764: Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 3783: Mrs. DEMINGS and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

H.R. 3816: Ms. DEAN.

H.R. 3867: Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 3921: Mr. MURPHY of North Carolina.

H.R. 3940: Ms. BOURDEAUX.

H.R. 3962: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. WOMACK, and Mr. ESTES.

H.R. 3990: Ms. MENG.

H.R. 4003: Mr. LAMB.

H.R. 4079: Mr. FOSTER.

H.R. 4085: Ms. JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 4122: Mr. VAN DREW.

H.R. 4134: Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. TITUS, and Mr. LEVIN of Michigan.

H.R. 4158: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 4312: Mr. POSEY and Mr. BUCK.

H.R. 4390: Mr. BOST.

H.R. 4411: Mrs. MCBATH.

H.R. 4421: Ms. NEWMAN.

H.R. 4455: Ms. CHU.

H.R. 4495: Mr. GOMEZ.

H.R. 4496: Ms. STANSBURY.

H.R. 4589: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 4646: Mr. MOORE of Utah.

H.R. 4693: Ms. KUSTER.

H.R. 4738: Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia.

H.R. 4766: Mr. LEVIN of Michigan.

H.R. 4767: Mr. MURPHY of North Carolina.

H.R. 4814: Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia.

H.R. 4826: Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. SARBANES, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. BROWN of Ohio, and Mr. HORSFORD.

H.R. 4827: Ms. PORTER and Mr. MOULTON.

H.R. 4878: Mr. BUCSHON.

H.R. 4943: Mr. LIEU.

H.R. 4944: Mr. LIEU.

H.R. 4965: Ms. BASS, Mr. LIEU, and Mr. LAWSON of Florida.

H.R. 5016: Mr. PHILLIPS.

H.R. 5053: Mr. SWALWELL.

H.R. 5073: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 5141: Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mrs. KIM of California, and Mr. KIND.

H.R. 5232: Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida.

H.R. 5261: Ms. TITUS.

H.R. 5370: Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. AGUILAR, and Mr. GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 5413: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.

H.R. 5444: Mr. STANTON and Ms. JAYAPAL.

H.R. 5508: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 5526: Ms. SHERRILL and Ms. CHU.

H.R. 5532: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 5533: Mr. HIMES.

H.R. 5536: Mr. VEASEY and Mr. AGUILAR.

H.R. 5631: Ms. STRICKLAND.

H.R. 5654: Mr. TONKO.

H.R. 5699: Mr. MULLIN.

H.R. 5724: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 5727: Mr. BERA.

H.R. 5735: Mr. SWALWELL.

H.R. 5754: Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.R. 5818: Mrs. WALORSKI.

H.R. 5819: Mr. GALLEGO.

H.R. 5841: Ms. KUSTER.

H.R. 5984: Mr. HORSFORD and Mr. RUIZ.

H.R. 6015: Mr. KUSTOFF, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. HUDSON, and Mr. ZELDIN.

H.R. 6087: Mr. GROTHMAN, Ms. ADAMS, Ms. SHERRILL, Mr. BOWMAN, and Mr. MFUME.

H.R. 6102: Ms. SHERRILL.

H.R. 6117: Mr. CÁRDENAS and Mr. SAN NICOLAS.

H.R. 6145: Mr. SCHWEIKERT.

H.R. 6201: Ms. BROWN of Ohio.

H.R. 6202: Mr. TONKO and Mr. HORSFORD.

H.R. 6205: Mr. SOTO.

H.R. 6219: Mrs. LAWRENCE and Mr. CARBAJAL.

H.R. 6225: Mr. NEGUSE and Ms. SCANLON.

H.R. 6270: Ms. DELBENE, Ms. PORTER, Ms. STRICKLAND, Ms. MACE, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 6272: Ms. PRESSLEY.

H.R. 6283: Mr. ALLRED.

H.R. 6321: Mr. MULLIN.

H.R. 6338: Mr. MRVAN and Ms. DEGETTE.

H.R. 6353: Mr. LEVIN of California.

H.R. 6375: Ms. STRICKLAND.

H.R. 6394: Mr. FERGUSON.

H.R. 6396: Mr. SAN NICOLAS.

H.R. 6398: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.

H.R. 6408: Ms. STANSBURY.

H.R. 6520: Mr. PETERS.

H.R. 6534: Mr. FITZGERALD and Mr. CLOUD.

H.R. 6536: Mr. SCHWEIKERT and Mr. KELLER.
 H.R. 6559: Ms. WILSON of Florida.
 H.R. 6577: Ms. BOURDEAUX.
 H.R. 6600: Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana and Ms. NORTON.
 H.R. 6612: Ms. CHU.
 H.R. 6630: Mr. LEVIN of California, Mr. BERA, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. LIEU, Ms. CHU, Ms. SPEIER, and Ms. LOFGREN.
 H.R. 6631: Mr. LEVIN of California, Mr. BERA, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. LIEU, Ms. CHU, Ms. SPEIER, and Ms. LOFGREN.
 H.R. 6636: Ms. BROWN of Ohio.
 H.R. 6663: Ms. MALLIOTAKIS.
 H.R. 6678: Ms. NEWMAN and Ms. DELAURO.
 H.R. 6699: Ms. CHU.
 H.R. 6725: Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. BERA, Ms. CHU, Mr. LEVIN of California, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SWALWELL, Mr. TAKANO, Mrs. TORRES of California, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. KHANNA, and Ms. ESHOO.
 H.R. 6743: Ms. STANSBURY.
 H.R. 6766: Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Ms. BROWN of Ohio.
 H.R. 6768: Mr. GARBARINO.
 H.R. 6769: Mrs. FISCHBACH.
 H.R. 6785: Ms. LOFGREN.
 H.R. 6787: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
 H.R. 6791: Mr. COLE.
 H.R. 6823: Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Ms. TLAIB, Ms. STANSBURY, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. PAPPAS.
 H.R. 6833: Mrs. HAYES, Ms. ADAMS, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. PETERS, Ms. TITUS, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. SHERRILL, and Mr. GOTTHEIMER.
 H.R. 6860: Mr. KHANNA, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. CHU, and Mr. SWALWELL.
 H.R. 6872: Ms. TITUS.
 H.R. 6891: Mr. ROSE.
 H.R. 6894: Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS.
 H.R. 6898: Ms. MANNING.
 H.R. 6911: Mr. CURTIS and Mr. CAREY.
 H.R. 6922: Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. MCNERNEY, and Mr. RUSH.
 H.R. 6929: Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mrs. SPARTZ, and Mr. KATKO.

H.R. 6936: Mr. GOOD of Virginia.
 H.R. 6940: Mr. LAHOOD.
 H.R. 6961: Mr. LEVIN of California.
 H.R. 6971: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. KHANNA.
 H.R. 6989: Mr. SCHIFF.
 H.R. 7011: Ms. CHU and Mr. CASE.
 H.R. 7018: Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ.
 H.R. 7019: Mr. HARDER of California.
 H.R. 7020: Ms. SPEIER and Ms. SCANLON.
 H.R. 7061: Ms. NEWMAN and Mr. HUFFMAN.
 H.R. 7062: Mr. SCHIFF.
 H.R. 7064: Mr. PETERS and Mr. FITZPATRICK.
 H.R. 7065: Mr. PETERS.
 H.R. 7073: Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. TONKO, and Mr. FITZPATRICK.
 H.R. 7075: Ms. DEGETTE.
 H.R. 7077: Ms. MENG and Mr. BOWMAN.
 H.R. 7078: Ms. PINGREE, Mr. BUDD, Mr. PAPPAS, and Ms. DEAN.
 H.R. 7088: Mr. BUCSHON.
 H.R. 7094: Mr. ROSENDALE.
 H.R. 7107: Mrs. LESKO.
 H.R. 7115: Mr. KELLER, Mr. MEUSER, Mrs. BICE of Oklahoma, Mr. PALMER, and Mr. GARBARINO.
 H.R. 7116: Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. NEGUSE, and Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.
 H.R. 7122: Mrs. HAYES.
 H.R. 7144: Mr. CASE.
 H.R. 7149: Ms. BROWN of Ohio.
 H.R. 7186: Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. BENTZ, and Mr. HUDSON.
 H.R. 7189: Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mr. STAUBER, and Mr. BOST.
 H.R. 7199: Mr. NEWHOUSE.
 H.J. Res. 1: Mr. HARDER of California, Ms. STRICKLAND, Mrs. LEE of Nevada, Mrs. MCBATH, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. AGUILAR, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. PETERS, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. STANTON, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. RUIZ, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. SOTO, Ms. CRAIG, Mrs. CHERFILUS-MCCORMICK, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. TITUS, Mrs. TORRES of California, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. MORELLE, and Ms. CLARKE of New York.
 H.J. Res. 72: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana,

Mr. KUSTOFF, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. KELLER, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. DUNN, Mr. GARCIA of California, Mr. LATURNER, Mr. VALADAO, Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS, Mr. ISSA, Mr. GALLAGHER, and Mr. BURCHETT.
 H.J. Res. 76: Mr. LATTA.
 H.J. Res. 79: Mr. HUIZENGA, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. LAMBORN, Mrs. MILLER of Illinois, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. MAST, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. BOEBERT, Mr. LATTA, and Mr. DAVIDSON.
 H.J. Res. 80: Mr. PALLONE.
 H. Con. Res. 60: Ms. PORTER.
 H. Con. Res. 77: Ms. SALAZAR.
 H. Res. 69: Mr. KHANNA, Ms. STANSBURY, and Mr. POCAN.
 H. Res. 226: Mr. PAYNE.
 H. Res. 289: Mr. LEVIN of Michigan.
 H. Res. 290: Mr. RUIZ.
 H. Res. 404: Mr. DUNN.
 H. Res. 517: Ms. BOURDEAUX.
 H. Res. 724: Mr. SHERMAN.
 H. Res. 874: Mrs. LESKO and Ms. FOXF.
 H. Res. 891: Ms. SHERRILL.
 H. Res. 942: Mr. GRIJALVA.
 H. Res. 963: Mr. BUCSHON.
 H. Res. 964: Mr. LEVIN of Michigan.
 H. Res. 988: Mr. JACKSON and Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN.
 H. Res. 990: Mr. FULCHER.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

OFFERED BY MR. PALLONE

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Energy and Commerce in H.R. 6833 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.